ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

Dixit insipiens in corde suo — Non est Deus!

E. G. McMullan, O.P.

SUPERNATURAL RELIGION

SUPERNATURAL RELIGION

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE

REALITY OF DIVINE REVELATION

POPULAR EDITION

CAREFULLY REVISED

[ISSUED FOR THE RATIONALIST PRESS ASSOCIATION, LIMITED]

Property of
COSA
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

LONDON:
WATTS & CO.
1902

[*The right of translation is reserved*]

Property of
CCSA
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

"Credulity is as real, if not so great, a sin as unbelief."—ARCHBISHOP TRENCH, *Notes on the Miracles of our Lord*, 8th ed., p. 27.

"The abnegation of reason is not the evidence of faith, but the confession of despair."—DR. LIGHTFOOT, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 4th ed., p. ix.

01689
ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

PREFACE

In preparing this edition it has been thought desirable to make some changes, both with the view of rendering the book more convenient to the reader, and bringing the argument as much as possible up to date. On the one hand, an entirely new chapter has been introduced dealing with the evidence of "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," an ancient treatise which had not been published when the last edition was issued. Much pertinent matter regarding the martyrdom of Ignatius, which has hitherto only formed part of the preface to the sixth and complete editions, has now been suitably incorporated in the text. In a similar way, considerable additions have been made to the chapter on Tatian, dealing with more recent information on the nature of his *Diatessaron*. A still more important insertion in this edition is a critical examination of the use of the works of Josephus by the author of the third Synoptic and the Acts of the Apostles, by which fresh light has been thrown upon the date at which those writings must have been produced.

On the other hand, the long lists of writers on different subjects treated in the text have been omitted, where direct quotations have not been made from their works, or where such references were not considered specially interesting. The long linguistic analyses of speeches in the Acts of the Apostles, and unnecessary Greek quotations in the notes throughout, have also been omitted as of little interest to general readers. Any student desirous of examining these is referred to the complete or earlier

editions. Nothing has been removed, however, which is of any importance to the main argument, and much that is of interest has been added.

For the rest, whatever improvement could be effected in the style of the book has been carefully carried out, and it is hoped that this edition has considerably gained in clearness and precision. Except in this respect, the Conclusions have not been materially altered, but, on the contrary, after bearing the test of many years of thought and study, they are repeated with unhesitating confidence.

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION - - - - - - - xiii

PART I.—MIRACLES

CHAPTER I.

MIRACLES IN RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY - - - - 1

CHAPTER II.

MIRACLES IN RELATION TO THE ORDER OF NATURE - - - 18

CHAPTER III.

REASON IN RELATION TO THE ORDER OF NATURE - - - 33

CHAPTER IV.

THE AGE OF MIRACLES - - - - - - - - 55

CHAPTER V.

THE PERMANENT STREAM OF MIRACULOUS PRETENSION - - 83

CHAPTER VI.

MIRACLES IN RELATION TO IGNORANCE AND SUPERSTITION - - 109

PART II.—THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

INTRODUCTION

NATURE OF THE EXAMINATION TO BE UNDERTAKEN, AND CANONS OF CRITICISM - - - - - - - 121

CHAPTER I.

CLEMENT OF ROME - - - - - - - 128
THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS - - - - - - 137
THE PASTOR OF HERMAS - - - - - - 148
THE TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES - - - - 149

CHAPTER II.

THE EPISTLES OF IGNATIUS - - - - - - 158
THE EPISTLE OF POLYCARP - - - - - - 175

CHAPTER III.

JUSTIN MARTYR - - - - - - - - - 181

CHAPTER IV.

HEGESIPPUS - - - - - - - - - 268
PAPIAS OF HIERAPOLIS - - - - - - - - 276

CHAPTER V.

THE CLEMENTINES - - - - - - - - 299
THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS - - - - - - 320

CHAPTER VI.

BASILIDES - - - - - - - - - 322
VALENTINUS - - - - - - - - - 330

CHAPTER VII.

MARCION - - - - - - - - - - 344

CHAPTER VIII.

TATIAN - - - - - - - - - - 366
DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH - - - - - - - - 381

CHAPTER IX.

MELITO OF SARDIS - - - - - - - - 387
CLAUDIUS APOLLINARIS - - - - - - - 395
ATHENAGORAS - - - - - - - - - 398
EPISTLE OF VIENNE AND LYONS - - - - - - 404

CHAPTER X.

PTOLEMÆUS AND HERACLEON - - - - - - 408
CELSUS - - - - - - - - - 422
THE CANON OF MURATORI - - - - - - 427
RESULTS - - - - - - - - - 433

PART III.—THE FOURTH GOSPEL

CHAPTER I.

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE - - - - - - 435

CHAPTER II.

THE AUTHORSHIP AND CHARACTER OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL - 510

PART IV.—THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

CHAPTER I.

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE - - - - - - 567

CHAPTER II.

EVIDENCE REGARDING THE AUTHORSHIP - - - - 585

CHAPTER III.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK. DESIGN AND COMPOSITION - 613

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY - - - - - - - - - 638

CHAPTER V.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. STEPHEN THE MARTYR - - - - - - - - - 659

CHAPTER VI.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. PHILIP IN SAMARIA. PETER AND CORNELIUS - - - - - - - 673

CHAPTER VII.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. PAUL THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES - - - - - - - - 686

PART V.—THE DIRECT EVIDENCE FOR MIRACLES

CHAPTER I.

THE EPISTLES AND THE APOCALYPSE - - - - - - 753

CHAPTER II.

THE EVIDENCE OF PAUL - - - - - - - 756

PART VI.—THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION

CHAPTER I.

THE RELATION OF EVIDENCE TO ITS SUBJECT - - - - 801

CHAPTER II.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE GOSPELS - - - - - - 808

CHAPTER III.

THE EVIDENCE OF PAUL - - - - - - - 851

CONCLUSIONS - - - - - - - - - 902

INTRODUCTION

THEORETICALLY, the duty of adequate inquiry into the truth of any statement of serious importance before believing it is universally admitted. Practically, no duty is more universally neglected. This is more especially the case in regard to Religion, in which our concern is so great, yet whose credentials so few personally examine. The difficulty of such an investigation and the inability of most men to pursue it, whether from want of opportunity or want of knowledge, are, no doubt, the chief reasons for this neglect; but another, and scarcely less potent, obstacle has probably been the odium which has been attached to any doubt regarding the dominant religion, as well as the serious, though covert, discouragement of the Church to all critical examination of the title-deeds of Christianity. The spirit of doubt, if not of intelligent inquiry, however, has, of late years, become too strong for repression, and, at the present day, the pertinency of the question of a German writer, "Are we still Christians?" receives unconscious illustration from many a popular pulpit and many a social discussion.

The prevalent characteristic of popular theology in England at this time may be said to be a tendency to eliminate from Christianity, with thoughtless dexterity, every supernatural element which does not quite accord with current opinion, and yet to ignore the fact that in so doing it has practically been altogether abandoned. This tendency is fostered with illogical zeal by many distinguished men within the Church itself, who endeavour to arrest the pursuing wolves of doubt and unbelief which press upon it by practically throwing to them, scrap by scrap, the very doctrines which constitute the claims of Christianity to be regarded as a Divine Revelation at all. They try to spiritualise or dilute that which remains into a form which does not shock their reason; and yet they cling to the delusion that they still retain the consolation and the hope of truths which, if not divinely

revealed, are mere human speculation regarding matters beyond reason.

Christianity itself distinctly claims to be a direct Divine Revelation of truths beyond the natural attainment of the human intellect. To submit the doctrines thus revealed, therefore, to criticism, and to clip and prune them down to the standard of human reason, whilst, at the same time, their supernatural character is maintained, is an obvious absurdity. Christianity must either be recognised to be a Divine Revelation beyond man's criticism, and, in that case, its doctrines must be received even though Reason cannot be satisfied, or the claims of Christianity to be such a Divine Revelation must be disallowed, in which case it becomes the legitimate subject of criticism like every other human system. One or other of these alternatives must be adopted; but to assert that Christianity is Divine, and yet to deal with it as human, is illogical and wrong.

When we consider the vast importance of the interests involved, therefore, it must be apparent that there can be no more urgent problem for humanity to solve than the question: Is Christianity a supernatural Divine Revelation or not? To this we may demand a clear and decisive answer. The evidence must be of no uncertain character which can warrant our abandoning the guidance of Reason, and blindly accepting doctrines which, if not supernatural truths, must be rejected by the human intellect as monstrous delusions. We propose in this work to seek a conclusive answer to this momentous question.

We must, by careful and impartial investigation, acquire the right to our belief, whatever it may be, and not float like a mere waif into the nearest haven. Even true conclusions which are arrived at either accidentally or by wrong methods are dangerous. The current which by good fortune led to-day to truth may to-morrow waft us to falsehood.

If we look at the singular diversity of views entertained, not only with regard to the doctrines, but also to the evidences, of Christianity, we cannot but be struck by the deplorable position in which Divine Revelation is now placed.

Orthodox Christians may be divided into two broad classes, one of which professes to base the Church upon the Bible, and the other the Bible upon the Church. The one party assert that the Bible is fully and absolutely inspired, that it contains God's

revelation to man, and that it is the only and sufficient ground for all religious belief; and they maintain that its authenticity is proved by the most ample and irrefragable external as well as internal evidence. On the other hand, men of undoubted piety and learning, as well as unquestioned orthodoxy, admit that the Bible is totally without literary or historical evidence, and cannot for a moment be upheld upon any such grounds as the revealed word of God; that none of the great doctrines of ecclesiastical Christianity can be deduced from the Bible, but that, notwithstanding this absence of external and internal evidence, this Revelation stands upon the sure basis of the inspiration of the Church. Can the unsupported testimony of a Church which in every age has vehemently maintained errors and denounced truths which are now universally recognised, be considered sufficient guarantee of Divine Revelation? Obviously, there is no ground for accepting from a fallible Church and fallacious tradition doctrines which, avowedly, are beyond the criterion of reason, and therefore require miraculous evidence.

With belief based upon such uncertain grounds, and with such vital difference of views regarding evidence, it is not surprising that ecclesiastical Christianity has felt its own weakness, and entrenched itself against the assaults of investigation. Such inquiry, however, cannot be suppressed. Mere scientific questions may be regarded with apathy by those who do not feel their personal bearing. It may possibly seem to some a matter of little practical importance to them to determine whether the earth revolves round the sun, or the sun round the earth; but no earnest mind can fail to perceive the immense personal importance of Truth in regard to Religion—the necessity of investigating, before accepting, dogmas, the right interpretation of which is represented as necessary to salvation—and the clear duty, before abandoning reason for faith, to exercise reason, in order that faith may not be mere credulity.

It was in this conviction that the following inquiry into the reality of Divine Revelation was originally undertaken, and in this spirit others should enter upon it. An able writer, who will not be suspected of exaggeration on this subject, has said: "The majority of mankind, perhaps, owe their belief, rather to the outward influence of custom and education, than to any strong principle of faith within; and it is to be feared that many, if they came to perceive how wonderful what they believed was, would not find

their belief so easy, and so matter-of-course a thing as they appear to find it."[1] If it is to be more than a mere question of priority of presentation whether we are to accept Buddhism, Mohammedanism, or Christianity, we must strictly and fearlessly examine the evidence upon which they profess to stand. The neglect of examination can never advance truth, as the severest scrutiny can never retard it; but belief without discrimination can only foster ignorance and superstition.

To no earnest mind can such inquiry be otherwise than a serious and often a painful task; but, dismissing preconceived ideas and preferences derived from habit and education, and seeking only the Truth, holding it, whatever it may be, to be the only object worthy of desire or capable of satisfying a rational mind, the quest cannot but end in peace and satisfaction. In such an investigation, however, to quote words of Archbishop Whateley, "It makes all the difference in the world whether we place Truth in the first place or in the second place"; for if Truth acquired do not compensate for every pet illusion dispelled, the path is thorny indeed, although it must still be faithfully trodden.

[1] J. B. Mozley, B.D., on Miracles; *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, 2nd ed., p. 4.

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE

REALITY OF DIVINE REVELATION

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

MIRACLES IN RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY

At the very outset of inquiry into the origin and true character of Christianity we are brought face to face with the Supernatural. Christianity professes to be a Divine revelation of truths which the human intellect could not otherwise have discovered. It is not a form of religion developed by the wisdom of man and appealing to his reason, but a system miraculously communicated to the human race, the central doctrines of which are either superhuman or untenable. If the truths said to be revealed were either of an ordinary character or naturally attainable, they would at once discredit the claim to a Divine origin. No one could maintain that a system discoverable by reason would be supernaturally communicated. The whole argument for Christianity turns upon the necessity of such a revelation, and the consequent probability that it would be made.

There is nothing singular, it may be remarked, in the claim of Christianity to be a direct revelation from God. With the exception of the religions of Greece and Rome, which, however, also had their subsidiary supposition of Divine inspiration, there has scarcely been any system of religion which has not been proclaimed to the world as a direct Divine communication. Long before Christianity claimed this character, the religions of India had anticipated the idea. To quote the words of an accomplished scholar: "According to the orthodox views of Indian theologians,

not a single line of the Veda was the work of human authors. The whole Veda is in some way or other the work of the Deity; and even those who received it were not supposed to be ordinary mortals, but beings raised above the level of common humanity, and less liable, therefore, to error in the reception of revealed truth."[1] The same origin is claimed for the religion of Zoroaster, whose doctrines, beyond doubt, exercised great influence at least upon later Jewish theology, and whose Magian followers are appropriately introduced beside the cradle of Jesus, as the first to do honour to the birth of Christianity. In the same way Mohammed announced his religion as directly communicated from heaven.

Christianity, however, as a religion professing to be divinely revealed, is not only supernatural in origin and doctrine, but its claim to acceptance is necessarily based upon supernatural evidence; for it is obvious that truths which require to be miraculously communicated do not come within the range of our intellect, and cannot, therefore, be intelligently received upon internal testimony. "And, certainly," says an able Bampton Lecturer, "if it was the will of God to give a revelation, there are plain and obvious reasons for asserting that miracles are necessary as the guarantee and voucher for that revelation. A revelation is, properly speaking, such only by virtue of telling us something which we could not know without it. But how do we know that that communication of what is undiscoverable by human reason is true? Our reason cannot prove the truth of it, for it is by the very supposition beyond our reason. There must be, then, some note or sign to certify to it and distinguish it as a true communication from God, which note can be nothing else than a miracle."[2] In another place the same Lecturer stigmatises the belief of the Mohammedan "as in its very principle irrational," because he accepts the account which Mohammed gave of himself, without supernatural evidence.[3] The belief of the Christian is contrasted with it as rational, "because the Christian believes in a supernatural dispensation upon the proper evidence of such a dispensation—viz., the miraculous."[4] Mohammed is reproached with having "an utterly barbarous idea of evidence, and a total miscalculation of the claims of reason," because he did not consider miraculous evidence necessary to attest a supernatural dispensation; "whereas

[1] M. Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, 1867, vol. i., p. 18.
[2] J. B. Mozley, B.D., Bampton Lecturer in 1865, on *Miracles*, 2nd ed., 1867, p. 6 f.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 30, cf. Butler, *Analogy of Religion*, pt. ii., chap. vii., § 3; Paley, *A View of the Evidences of Christianity*, ed. Whately, 1859, p. 324 ff.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 31.

the Gospel is adapted to perpetuity for this cause especially, with others, that it was founded upon a true calculation, and a foresight of the permanent need of evidence; our Lord admitting the inadequacy of His own mere word, and the necessity of a rational guarantee to His revelation of His own nature and commission."[1]

The spontaneous offer of miraculous evidence, indeed, has always been advanced as a special characteristic of Christianity, logically entitling it to acceptance in contradistinction to all other religions. "It is an acknowledged historical fact," says Bishop Butler, "that Christianity offered itself to the world, and demanded to be received, upon the allegation—*i.e.*, as unbelievers would speak, upon the pretence—of miracles, publicly wrought to attest the truth of it in such an age;.....and Christianity, including the dispensation of the Old Testament, seems distinguished by this from all other religions."[2]

Most of the great English divines have clearly recognised and asserted the necessity of supernatural evidence to establish the reality of a supernatural revelation. Bishop Butler affirms miracles and the completion of prophecy to be the "direct and fundamental proofs" of Christianity.[3] Elsewhere he says: "The notion of a miracle, considered as a proof of a divine mission, has been stated with great exactness by divines, and is, I think, sufficiently understood by everyone. There are also invisible miracles—the Incarnation of Christ, for instance—which, being secret, cannot be alleged as a proof of such a mission, but require themselves to be proved by visible miracles. Revelation itself, too, is miraculous; and miracles are the proof of it."[4] Paley states the case with equal clearness: "In what way can a revelation be made but by miracles? In none which we are able to conceive."[5] His argument, in fact, is founded upon the principle that "nothing but miracles could decide the authority" of Christianity.[6] In another work he asserts that no man can prove a future retribution but the teacher "who testifies by miracles that his doctrine comes from God."[7] Bishop Atterbury, again, referring to the principal doctrines of ecclesiastical Christianity, says: "It is this kind of Truth that God is properly said to reveal; Truths, of which, unless revealed, we should have

[1] *Ib.*, p. 32.
[2] *The Analogy of Religion*, pt. ii., ch. vii., § 3.
[3] *Ib.*, pt. ii., ch. vii.
[4] *Ib.*, pt. ii., ch. ii., § 1.
[5] *A View of the Evidences of Christianity.* "Preparatory Considerations," p. 12.
[6] *Ib.*, p. 14.
[7] *Moral Philosophy*, book v. Speaking of Christianity, in another place, he calls miracles and prophecy "that splendid apparatus with which its mission was introduced and attested" (book iv.).

always continued ignorant; and 'tis in order only to prove these Truths to have been really revealed that we affirm Miracles to be Necessary."[1]

Dr. Heurtley, Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, after pointing out that the doctrines taught as the Christian Revelation are such as could not by any possibility have been attained by the unassisted human reason, and that, consequently, it is reasonable that they should be attested by miracles, continues: "Indeed, it seems inconceivable how without miracles —including prophecy in the notion of a miracle—it could sufficiently have commended itself to men's belief? Who would believe, or would be justified in believing, the great facts which constitute its substance on the *ipse dixit* of an unaccredited teacher? and how, except by miracles, could the first teacher be accredited? Paley, then, was fully warranted in the assertion..... that 'we cannot conceive a revelation'—such a revelation of course as Christianity professes to be, a revelation of truths which transcend man's ability to discover—'to be substantiated without miracles.' Other credentials, it is true, might be exhibited *in addition* to miracles—and such it would be natural to look for—but it seems impossible that miracles could be dispensed with."[2] Dr. Mansel bears similar testimony: "A teacher who proclaims himself to be specially sent by God, and whose teaching is to be received on the authority of that mission, must, from the nature of the case, establish his claim by proofs of another kind than those which merely evince his human wisdom or goodness. A superhuman authority needs to be substantiated by superhuman evidence; and what is superhuman is miraculous."[3]

Newman, in discussing the idea and scope of miracles, says: "A revelation—that is, a direct message from God to man—itself bears in some degree a miraculous character.....And as a revelation itself, so again the evidences of a revelation may all more or less be considered miraculous.....It might even be said that, strictly speaking, no evidence of a revelation is conceivable which does not partake of the character of a miracle; since nothing but a display of power over the existing system of things can attest the immediate presence of Him by whom it was originally established."[4]

Dr. Mozley has stated in still stronger terms the necessity that

[1] *Sermons*, etc. Sermon viii., "Miracles the Most Proper Way of Proving any Religion" (vol. iii., 1766, p. 199).

[2] *Replies to Essays and Reviews*, 1862, p. 151.

[3] *Aids to Faith*, 4th ed., 1863, p. 35.

[4] *Two Essays on Scripture Miracles and on Ecclesiastical*, by John H. Newman, 2nd ed., 1870, p. 6 f.

Christianity should be authenticated by the evidence of miracles. He supposes the case that a person of evident integrity and loftiness of character had appeared, eighteen centuries ago, announcing himself as pre-existent from all eternity, the Son of God, Maker of the world, who had come down from heaven and assumed the form and nature of man in order to be the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world, and so on, enumerating other doctrines of Christianity. Dr. Mozley then asks: "What would be the inevitable conclusion of sober reason respecting that person? The necessary conclusion of sober reason respecting that person would be that he was disordered in his understanding.....By no rational being could a just and benevolent life be accepted as proof of such astonishing announcements. Miracles are the necessary complement, then, of the truth of such announcements, which, without them, are purposeless and abortive, the unfinished fragments of a design which is nothing unless it is the whole. They are necessary to the justification of such announcements, which indeed, unless they are supernatural truths, are the wildest delusions."[1] He, therefore, concludes that "Christianity cannot be maintained as a revelation undiscoverable by human reason, a revelation of a supernatural scheme for man's salvation, without the evidence of miracles."[2]

In all points Christianity is emphatically a Supernatural Religion, claiming to be divine in its origin, superhuman in its essence, and miraculous in its evidence. It cannot be accepted without an absolute belief in miracles, and those who profess to hold the religion whilst they discredit its supernatural elements—and they are many at the present day—have widely seceded from ecclesiastical Christianity. Miracles, it is true, are external to Christianity in so far as they are evidential, but inasmuch as it is admitted that miracles alone can attest the reality of Divine revelation they are still inseparable from it; and as the contents of the revelation are, so to say, more miraculous than its attesting miracles, the supernatural enters into the very substance of Christianity, and cannot be eliminated. It is obvious, therefore, that the reality of miracles is the vital point in the investigation which we have undertaken. If the reality of miracles cannot be established, Christianity loses the only evidence by which its truth can be sufficiently attested. If miracles be incredible, the supernatural revelation and its miraculous evidence must together be rejected.

This fact is thoroughly recognised by the ablest Christian divines. Dean Mansel, speaking of the position of miracles in

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, p. 14. [2] *Ib.*, p. 23.

regard to Christianity, says: "The question, however, assumes a very different character when it relates, not to the comparative importance of miracles as evidences, but to their reality as facts, and as facts of a supernatural kind. For, if this is denied, the denial does not merely remove one of the supports of a faith which may yet rest securely on other grounds. On the contrary, the whole system of Christian belief with its evidences.....all Christianity, in short, so far as it has any title to that name, so far as it has any special relation to the person or the teaching of Christ, is overthrown at the same time."[1] A little further on he says: "If there be one fact recorded in Scripture which is entitled, in the fullest sense of the word, to the name of a miracle, the RESURRECTION OF CHRIST is that fact. Here, at least, is an instance in which the entire Christian faith must stand or fall with our belief in the supernatural."[2] He, therefore, properly repudiates the view, "which represents the question of the possibility of miracles as one which merely affects the *external accessories* of Christianity, leaving the *essential doctrines* untouched"[3] Dr. Mozley, in a similar manner, argues the inseparable union of miracles with the Christian faith. "Indeed, not only are miracles *conjoined* with doctrine in Christianity, but miracles are inserted *in* the doctrine and are part of its contents. A man cannot state his belief as a Christian in the terms of the Apostles' Creed without asserting them. Can the doctrine of our Lord's Incarnation be disjoined from one physical miracle? Can the doctrine of His justification of us and intercession for us be disjoined from another?.....If a miracle is incorporated as an article in a creed, that article of the creed, the miracle, and the proof of it by a miracle, are all one thing. The great miracles, therefore, upon the evidence of which the Christian scheme rested, being thus inserted in the Christian Creed, the belief in the Creed was of itself the belief in the miraculous evidence of it.....Thus miracles and the supernatural contents of Christianity must stand or fall together."[4] Dr. Heurtley, referring to the discussion of the reality of miracles, exclaims: "It is not too much to say, therefore, that the question is vital as regards Christianity."[5] Dr. Westcott not less emphatically makes the same statement. "It is evident," he says, "that if the claim to be a miraculous religion is essentially incredible, apostolic Christianity is simply false.....The essence of Christianity lies in a miracle; and, if it can be shown that a miracle is either impossible or incredible, all further inquiry into the details of its history is superfluous in a

[1] *Aids to Faith*, 1863, p. 3. [2] *Ib.*, p. 4.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 5. [4] *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, p. 21 f.
[5] *Replies to Essays and Reviews*, 1862, p. 143.

religious point of view."[1] Similarly, Dr. Farrar has said: "However skilfully the modern ingenuity of semi-belief may have tampered with supernatural interpositions, it is clear to every honest and unsophisticated mind that, if miracles be incredible, Christianity is false. If Christ wrought no miracles, then the Gospels are untrustworthy.....If the Resurrection be merely a spiritual idea, or a mythicised hallucination, then our religion has been founded on an error....."[2]

It has been necessary clearly to point our this indissoluble connection between ecclesiastical Christianity and the supernatural, in order that the paramount importance of the question as to the credibility of miracles should be duly appreciated. Our inquiry into the reality of Divine Revelation, then, whether we consider its contents or its evidence, practically reduces itself to the very simple issue: Are miracles antecedently credible? Did they ever really take place? We do not intend to confine ourselves merely to a discussion of the abstract question, but shall also endeavour to form a correct estimate of the value of the specific allegations which are advanced.

Having, then, ascertained that miracles are absolutely necessary to attest the reality of Divine revelation, we may proceed to examine them more closely, and for the present we shall confine ourselves to the representations of these phenomena which are given in the Bible. Throughout the Old Testament the doctrine is inculcated that supernatural communications must have supernatural attestation. God is described as arming his servants with power to perform wonders, in order that they may thus be accredited as his special messengers. The Patriarchs and the people of Israel generally are represented as demanding "a sign" of the reality of communications said to come from God, without which, we are led to suppose, they not only would not have believed, but would have been justified in disbelieving, that the message actually came from him. Thus Gideon[3] asks for a sign that the Lord talked with him, and Hezekiah[4] demands proof of the truth of Isaiah's prophecy that he should be restored to health. It is, however, unnecessary to refer to instances, for it may be affirmed that, upon all occasions, miraculous evidence of an alleged divine mission is stated to have been required and accorded.

The startling information is at the same time given, however,

[1] *The Gospel of the Resurrection*, 3rd ed., 1874, p. 34.

[2] *The Witness of History to Christ*, Hulsean Lectures for 1870, 2nd ed., 1872, p. 25.

[3] Judges vi. 17. [4] 2 Kings xx. 8 f.

that miracles may be wrought to attest what is false, as well as to accredit what is true. In one place[1] it is declared that, if a prophet actually gives a sign or wonder, and it comes to pass, but teaches the people, on the strength of it, to follow other gods, they are not to hearken to him, and the prophet is to be put to death. The false miracle is, here,[2] attributed to God himself: "For the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul." In the book of the Prophet Ezekiel the case is stated in a still stronger way, and God is represented as directly deceiving the prophet: "And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the Lord have deceived that prophet, and I will stretch out my hand upon him, and will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel."[3] God, in fact, is represented as exerting his almighty power to deceive a man, and then as destroying him for being deceived. In the same spirit is the passage[4] in which Micaiah describes the Lord as putting a lying spirit into the mouths of the prophets who incited Ahab to go to Ramoth-Gilead. Elsewhere,[5] and notably in the New Testament, we find an ascription of real signs and wonders to another power than God. Jesus himself is represented as warning his disciples against false prophets, who work signs and wonders: "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?" of whom he should say: "I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity."[6] And again in another place: "For false prophets shall arise, and shall work signs and wonders (*σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα*) to seduce, if it were possible, the elect."[7] Also, when the Pharisees accuse him of casting out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils, Jesus asks: "By whom do your children cast them out?"[8] a reply which would lose all its point if they were not admitted to be able to cast out devils. In another passage John is described as saying: "Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, who followeth not us, and we forbad him."[9] Without multiplying instances, however, there can be no doubt of the fact that the reality of false miracles and lying wonders is admitted in the Bible.

The obvious deduction from this representation of miracles is

[1] Deut. xiii. 1 ff. [2] Deut. xiii. 3.

[3] Ezek. xiv. 9. The narrative of God's hardening the heart of Pharaoh in order to bring other plagues upon the land of Egypt is in this vein.

[4] 1 Kings xxii. 14–23.

[5] The counter miracles of the Egyptian sorcerers need not be referred to as instances. Ex. vii. 11, 12, 22.

[6] Matt. vii. 22, 23. [7] Mark xiii. 22.

[8] Matt. xii. 27. [9] Mark ix. 38.

that the source and purpose of such supernatural phenomena must always be exceedingly uncertain.[1] Their evidential value is, therefore, profoundly affected, "it being," as Newman has said of ambiguous miracles, "antecedently improbable that the Almighty should rest the credit of His revelation upon events which but obscurely implied His immediate presence."[2] As it is affirmed that other supernatural beings exist, as well as an assumed Personal God, by whose agency miracles are performed, it is impossible to argue with reason that such phenomena are at any time specially due to the intervention of the Deity. Newman recognises this, but passes over the difficulty with masterly lightness of touch. After advancing the singular argument that our knowledge of spirits is only derived from Scripture, and that their existence cannot be deduced from nature, whilst he asserts that the being of a God—a Personal God be it remembered—can be so discovered, and that, therefore, miracles can only properly be attributed to him, he proceeds: "Still, it may be necessary to show that on our own principles we are not open to inconsistency. That is, it has been questioned whether, in admitting the existence and power of Spirits on the authority of Revelation, we are not in danger of invalidating the evidence upon which that authority rests. For the cogency of the argument for miracles depends on the assumption that interruptions in the course of nature must ultimately proceed from God, which is not true if they may be effected by other beings without His sanction. And it must be conceded that, explicit as Scripture is in considering miracles as signs of Divine agency, it still does seem to give created spirits some power of working them; and even in its most literal sense intimates the possibility of working them in opposition to the true doctrine (Deut. xiii. 1–3; Matt. xxiv. 24; 2 Thess. ii. 9–11)."[3] Newman repudiates the attempts of various writers to overcome this difficulty by making a distinction between great miracles and small, many miracles and few, or by referring to the nature of the doctrine attested in order to determine the author of the miracle, or by denying the power of spirits altogether, and explaining away Scripture statements of demoniacal possession and the narrative of the Lord's Temptation. "Without having recourse to any of these dangerous modes of answering the objection," he says, "it

[1] Tertullian saw this difficulty, and in his work against Marcion he argues that miracles alone, without prophecy, could not sufficiently prove Christ to be the Son of God; for he points out that Jesus himself forewarned his disciples that false Christs would come with signs and wonders, like the miracles which he himself had worked, whom he enjoined them beforehand not to believe. *Adv. Marc.*, iii. 3. So also the Author of the *Clementines*, xvii. 14.

[2] *Two Essays on Miracles*, p. 31.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 50 f.

may be sufficient to reply that since, agreeably to the antecedent sentiment of reason, God has adopted miracles as the seal of a divine message, we believe he will never suffer them to be so counterfeited as to deceive the humble inquirer."[1] This is the only reply which even so powerful a reasoner as Newman can give to an objection based on distinct statements of Scripture itself. He cannot deny the validity of the objection; he can only hope or believe in spite of it. Personal belief, independent of evidence, is the most common and the weakest of arguments; at the best, it is prejudice masked in the garb of reason. It is perfectly clear that miracles being thus acknowledged to be common both to God and to other spirits, they cannot be considered a distinctive attestation of divine intervention; and, as Spinoza finely argued, not even the mere existence of God can be inferred from them; for, as a miracle is a limited act, and never expresses more than a certain and limited power, it is certain that we cannot from such an effect conclude even the existence of a cause whose power is infinite.[2]

This dual character obviously leads to many difficulties in defining the evidential function and force of miracles, and we may best appreciate the dilemma which is involved by continuing to follow the statements and arguments of divines themselves. To the question whether miracles are absolutely to command the obedience of those in whose sight they are performed, and whether, upon their attestation, the doer and his doctrine are to be accepted as of God, Archbishop Trench unhesitatingly replies: "It cannot be so, for side by side with the miracles which serve for the furthering of the kingdom of God runs another line of wonders, the counter-workings of him who is ever the ape of the Most High."[3] The deduction is absolutely logical and cannot be denied. "This fact," he says, "that the kingdom of lies has its wonders no less than the kingdom of truth, is itself sufficient evidence that miracles cannot be appealed to absolutely and finally, in proof of the doctrine which the worker of them proclaims." This being the case, it is important to discover how miracles perform their function as the indispensable evidence for a Divine revelation, for with this disability they do not seem to possess much potentiality. Archbishop Trench, then, offers the following definition of the function of miracles: "A miracle does not prove the truth of a doctrine, or the divine mission of him that brings it to pass. That which alone it claims for him at the first is a right to be listened to; it puts him in the alternative

[1] *Two Essays on Scripture Miracles*, p. 51 f.
[2] *Opera, ed Tauchnitz*, vol iii., cap. vi., 24.
[3] *Notes on the Miracles of our Lord*, 8th ed., 1866, p. 22.

of being from heaven or from hell. The doctrine must first commend itself to the conscience as being *good*, and only then can the miracle seal it as *divine*. But the first appeal is from the doctrine to the conscience, to the moral nature of man."[1] Under certain circumstances, he maintains, their evidence is utterly to be rejected. "But the purpose of the miracle," he says, "being, as we have seen, to confirm that which is good, so, upon the other hand, where the mind and conscience witness against the doctrine, not all the miracles in the world have a right to demand submission to the word which they seal. On the contrary, the great act of faith is to believe, against, and in despite of them all, in what God has revealed to, and implanted in the soul of the holy and the true; not to believe another Gospel, though an angel from heaven, or one transformed into such, should bring it (Deut. xiii. 3; Gal. i. 8); and instead of compelling assent, miracles are then rather warnings to us that we keep aloof, for they tell us that not merely lies are here, for to that the conscience bore witness already, but that he who utters them is more than a common deceiver, is eminently 'a liar and an Anti-christ,' a false prophet—standing in more immediate connection than other deceived and evil men to the kingdom of darkness, so that Satan has given him his power (Rev. xiii. 2), is using him to be an especial organ of his, and to do a special work for him."[2] And he lays down the distinct principle that "The miracle must witness for itself, and the doctrine must witness for itself, and then, and then only, the first is capable of witnessing for the second."[3]

These opinions are not peculiar to the Archbishop of Dublin, but are generally held by divines, although Dr. Trench expresses them with unusual absence of reserve. Dr. Mozley emphatically affirms the same doctrine when he says: "A miracle cannot oblige us to accept any doctrine which is contrary to our moral nature, or to a fundamental principle of religion."[4] Dr. Mansel speaks

[1] *Notes*, etc., p. 25. Dr. Trench's views are of considerable eccentricity, and he seems to reproduce in some degree the Platonic theory of Reminiscence. He continues: "For all revelation presupposes in man a power of recognising the truth when it is shown him—that it will find an answer in him—that he will trace in it the lineaments of a friend, though of a friend from whom he has been long estranged, and whom he has well-nigh forgotten. It is the finding of a treasure, but of a treasure which he himself and no other had lost. The denial of this, that there is in man any organ by which truth may be recognised, opens the door to the most boundless scepticism—is, indeed, the denial of all that is god-like in man" (*Ib.*, p. 25). The Archbishop would probably be shocked if we suggested that the god-like organ of which he speaks is Reason.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 27 f. [3] *Ib.*, p. 33.

[4] *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, p. 25.

to the same effect: "If a teacher claiming to work miracles proclaims doctrines contradictory to previously established truths, whether to the conclusions of natural religion or to the teaching of a former revelation, such a contradiction is allowed, even by the most zealous defenders of the evidential value of miracles, to invalidate the authority of the teacher. But the right conclusion from this admission is not that true miracles are invalid as evidences, but that the supposed miracles in this case are not true miracles at all—*i.e.*, are not the effects of Divine power, but of human deception or of some other agency."[1] A passage from a letter written by Dr. Arnold which is quoted by Dr. Trench in support of his views both illustrates the doctrine and the necessity which has led to its adoption: "You complain," says Dr. Arnold, writing to Dr. Hawkins, "of those persons who judge of a revelation not by its evidence, but by its substance. It has always seemed to me that its substance is a most essential part of its evidence; and that miracles wrought in favour of what was foolish or wicked would only prove Manicheism. We are so perfectly ignorant of the unseen world that the character of any supernatural power can only be judged by the moral character of the statements which it sanctions. Thus only can we tell whether it be a revelation from God or from the Devil."[2] In another place Dr. Arnold declares: "Miracles must not be allowed to overrule the Gospel; for it is only through our belief in the Gospel that we accord our belief to them."[3]

[1] *Aids to Faith*, p. 32.

[2] *Life of Arnold*, ii., p. 226.

[3] *Lectures on Modern History*, p. 137. Those who hold such views forget that the greatest miracles of ecclesiastical Christianity are not external to it, but are the essence of its principal dogmas. If the "signs" and "wonders" which form what may be called the collateral miracles of Christianity are only believed in consequence of belief in the Gospel, upon what basis does belief in the miraculous birth, the Incarnation, the Resurrection, Ascension, and other leading dogmas, rest? These are themselves the Gospel. Newman, the character of whose mind leads him to believe every miracle the evidence against which does not absolutely prohibit his doing so, rather than only those the evidence for which constrains him to belief, supports ecclesiastical miracles somewhat at the expense of those of the Gospels. He points out that only a few of the latter now fulfil the purpose of evidence for a Divine revelation, and the rest are sustained and authenticated by those few; that "The many never have been evidence except to those who saw them, and have but held the place of doctrine ever since; like the truths revealed to us about the unseen world, which are matters of faith, not means of conviction. They have no existence, as it were, out of the record in which they are found." He then proceeds to refer to the criterion of a miracle suggested by Bishop Douglas: "We may suspect miracles to be false the account of which was not published at the time or place of their alleged occurrence, or, if so published, yet without careful attention being called to them." Newman then adds: "Yet St. Mark is said to have written at Rome, St. Luke in Rome or Greece, and St. John

It is obvious that the mutual dependence which is thus established between miracles and the doctrines in connection with which they are wrought destroys the evidential force of miracles, and that the first and the final appeal is made to reason. The doctrine, in fact, proves the miracle instead of the miracle attesting the doctrine. Divines of course attempt to deny this, but no other deduction from their own statements is logically possible. Miracles, according to Scripture itself, are producible by various supernatural beings, and may be Satanic as well as Divine; man, on the other hand, is so ignorant of the unseen world that avowedly he cannot, from the miracle itself, determine the agent by whom it was performed;[1] the miracle, therefore, has no intrinsic evidential value. How, then, according to divines, does it attain any potentiality? Only through a favourable decision on the part of Reason or the "moral nature in man" regarding the character of the doctrine. The result of the appeal to Reason respecting the morality and credibility of the doctrine determines the evidential status of the miracle. The doctrine, therefore, is the real criterion of the miracle which, without it, is necessarily an object of doubt and suspicion.

We have already casually referred to Newman's view of such a relation between miracle and doctrine, but may here more fully quote his suggestive remarks. "Others, by referring to the nature of the doctrine attested," he says, "in order to determine the author of the miracle, have exposed themselves to the plausible charge of adducing, first the miracle to attest the divinity of the doctrine, and then the doctrine to prove the divinity of the miracle."[2] This argument he characterises as one of the "dangerous modes" of removing a difficulty, although he does not himself point out a safer, and, in a note, he adds: "There is an appearance of doing honour to the Christian doctrines in representing them as *intrinsically* credible, which leads many into supporting opinions which, carried to their full extent, supersede the need of miracles altogether. It must be recollected, too, that they who are allowed to praise have the privilege of finding fault, and may reject, according to their *à priori* notions, as well as receive.

at Ephesus; and the earliest of the Evangelists wrote some years after the events recorded, while the latest did not write for sixty years; and moreover, true though it be that attention was called to Christianity from the first, yet it is true also that it did not succeed at the spot where it arose, but principally at a distance from it" (*Two Essays on Miracles*, etc., 2nd ed., 1870, p. 232 f.). How much these remarks might have been extended and strengthened by one more critical and less ecclesiastical than Newman need not here be stated.

[1] Newman says of a miracle: "Considered by itself, it is at most but the token of a superhuman being" (*Two Essays*, p. 10).

[2] *Two Essays*, etc., p. 51.

Doubtless the divinity of a clearly immoral doctrine could not be evidenced by miracles; for our belief in the moral attributes of God is much stronger than our conviction of the negative proposition that none but He can interfere with the system of nature.[1] But there is always the danger of extending this admission beyond its proper limits, of supposing ourselves adequate judges of the *tendency* of doctrines; and, because unassisted reason informs us what is moral and immoral in our own case, of attempting to decide on the abstract morality of actions.....These remarks are in nowise inconsistent with using (as was done in a former section) our actual knowledge of God's attributes, obtained from a survey of nature and human affairs, in determining the probability of certain professed miracles having proceeded from Him. It is one thing to infer from the experience of life, another to imagine the character of God from the gratuitous conceptions of our own minds."[2] Although Newman apparently fails to perceive that he himself thus makes reason the criterion of miracles, and therefore incurs the condemnation with which our quotation opens, the very indecision of his argument illustrates the dilemma in which divines are placed. Dr. Mozley, however, still more directly condemns the principle which we are discussing –that the doctrine must be the criterion of the miracle—although he also, as we have seen, elsewhere substantially affirms it. He says: "The position that the revelation proves the miracles, and not the miracles the revelation, admits of a good qualified meaning; but, taken literally, it is a double offence against the rule that things are properly proved by the proper proof of them; for a supernatural fact *is* the proper proof of a supernatural doctrine; while a supernatural doctrine, on the other hand, is certainly *not* the proper proof of a supernatural fact."[3]

[1] In another place, however, Newman, contrasting the "Rationalistic" and "Catholic" tempers, and condemning the former, says: "Rationalism is a certain abuse of reason—that is, a use of it for purposes for which it never was intended, and is unfitted. To rationalise in matters of revelation is to make our reason the standard and measure of the doctrines revealed; to stipulate that those doctrines should be such as to carry with them their own justification; to reject them if they come in collision with our existing opinions or habits of thought, or are with difficulty harmonised with our existing stock of knowledge" (*Essays, Crit. and Hist.*, 1872, vol. i., p. 31); and a little further on: "A like desire of judging for one's self is discernible in the original fall of man. Eve did not believe the Tempter any more than God's word, till she perceived 'the fruit was good for food'" (*Ib.*, p. 33). Newman, of course, wishes to limit his principle precisely to suit his own convenience; but in permitting the rejection of a supposed revelation in spite of miracles, on the ground of our disapproval of its morality, it is obvious that the doctrine is substantially made the final criterion of the miracle.

[2] *Two Essays*, etc., p. 51 f., note (*k*).

[3] *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, p. 19.

This statement is obviously true, but it is equally undeniable that, their origin being uncertain, miracles have no distinctive evidential force. How far, then, we may inquire in order thoroughly to understand the position, can doctrines prove the reality of miracles or determine the agency by which they are performed? In the case of moral truths within the limits of reason, it is evident that doctrines which are in accordance with our ideas of what is good and right do not require miraculous evidence at all. They can secure acceptance by their own merits alone. At the same time, it is universally admitted that the truth or goodness of a doctrine is, in itself, no proof that it emanates directly from God, and consequently the most obvious wisdom and beauty in the doctrine could not attest the Divine origin of a miracle. Such truths, however, have no proper connection with revelation at all. "*These* truths," to quote the words of Bishop Atterbury, "were of themselves sufficiently obvious and plain, and needed not a Divine testimony to make them plainer. But the truths which are necessary in this manner to be attested are those which are of positive institution; those which, if God had not pleased to reveal them, human reason could not have discovered; and those which, even now they are revealed, human reason cannot fully account for and perfectly comprehend."[1] How is it possible, then, that reason or "the moral nature in man" can approve as good, or appreciate the fitness of, doctrines which in their very nature are beyond the criterion of reason?[2] What reply, for instance, can reason give to any appeal to it regarding the doctrine of the Trinity or of the Incarnation? If doctrines the truth and goodness of which are apparent do not afford any evidence of Divine revelation, how can doctrines which reason can neither discover nor comprehend attest the Divine origin of miracles? Dr. Mozley clearly recognises that they cannot do so. "The proof of a revelation," he says—and, we may add, the proof of a miracle, itself a species of revelation—"which is contained in the substance of a revelation, has this inherent check or limit in it: viz., that it cannot reach to what is undiscoverable by reason. Internal evidence is itself an appeal to reason, because at every step the test is our own appreciation of such and such an idea or doctrine, our own perception of its fitness; but human reason cannot in the nature of the case prove that which, by the very hypothesis, lies beyond human reason."[3] It naturally follows that no doctrine which lies beyond reason, and therefore requires

[1] *Sermons*, 8th ed., 1766, vol. iii., p. 198.

[2] Bishop Butler says: "Christianity is a scheme quite beyond our comprehension" (*Analogy of Religion*, part ii., ch. iv., § 1).

[3] *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, p. 15.

the attestation of miracles, can possibly afford that indication of the source and reality of miracles which is necessary to endow them with evidential value; and the supernatural doctrine must, therefore, be rejected in the absence of miraculous evidence of a decisive character.

Dr. Mozley labours earnestly, but unsuccessfully, to restore to miracles as evidence some part of that potentiality of which these unfortunate limitations have deprived them. Whilst, on the one hand, he says, "We must admit, indeed, an inherent modification in the function of a miracle as an instrument of proof,"[1] he argues that this is only a limitation, and no disproof of it, and he contends that "The evidence of miracles is not negative, because it has conditions."[2] His reasoning, however, is purely apologetic, and attempts, by the unreal analogy of supposed limitations of natural principles and evidence, to excuse the disqualifying limitation of the supernatural. He is quite conscious of the serious difficulty of the position. "The question," he says, "may at first sight create a dilemma—If a miracle is nugatory on the side of one doctrine, what cogency has it on the side of another? Is it legitimate to accept its evidence when we please, and reject it when we please?" The only reply he seems able to give to these very pertinent questions is the remark which immediately follows them: "But in truth a miracle is never without an argumentative force, although that force may be counterbalanced."[3] In other words, a miracle is always an argument, although it is often a bad one. It is scarcely necessary to go to the supernatural for bad arguments.

It might naturally be expected that the miraculous evidence selected to accredit a Divine revelation should possess certain unique and marked characteristics. It must, at least, be clearly distinctive of Divine power, and exclusively associated with Divine truth. It is inconceivable that the Deity, deigning thus to attest the reality of a communication from himself of truths beyond the criterion of reason, should not make the evidence simple and complete, because, the doctrines proper to such a revelation not being appreciable from internal evidence, it is obvious that the external testimony for them—if it is to be of any use—must be unmistakable and decisive. The evidence which is actually produced, however, so far from satisfying these legitimate anticipations, lacks every one of the qualifications which reason antecedently declares to be necessary. Miracles are not distinctive of Divine power, but are common to Satan, and they are admitted to be performed in support of falsehood as well as in the service of truth. They bear, indeed, so little upon them the impress of their origin and true character that they are dependent for their

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, p. 25. [2] *Ib.*, p. 25. [3] *Ib.*, p. 25.

recognition upon our judgment of the very doctrines to attest which they are said to have been designed.

Even taking the representation of miracles, therefore, which divines themselves give, they are utterly incompetent to perform their contemplated functions. If they are superhuman they are not super-Satanic, and there is no sense in which they can be considered miraculously evidential of anything. To argue, as theologians do, that the ambiguity of their testimony is deliberately intended as a trial of our faith is absurd, for, reason being unable to judge of the nature either of supernatural fact or supernatural doctrine, it would be mere folly and injustice to subject to such a test beings avowedly incapable of sustaining it. Whilst it is absolutely necessary, then, that a Divine revelation should be attested by miraculous evidence to justify our believing it, the testimony so-called seems, in all respects, unworthy of the name, and presents anomalies much more suggestive of human invention than Divine originality. We are, in fact, prepared, even by the Scriptural account of miracles, to expect that further examination will supply an explanation of such phenomena which will wholly remove them from the region of the supernatural.

CHAPTER II.

MIRACLES IN RELATION TO THE ORDER OF NATURE

WITHOUT at present touching the question as to their reality, it may be well to ascertain what miracles are considered to be, and how far, and in what sense, it is asserted that they are supernatural. We have, hitherto, almost entirely confined our attention to the arguments of English divines, and we must for the present continue chiefly to deal with them, for it may broadly be said that they alone, at the present day, maintain the reality and supernatural character of such phenomena. No thoughtful mind can fail to see that, considering the function of miracles, this is the only logical and consistent course.[1] The insuperable difficulties in the way of admitting the reality of miracles, however, have driven the great majority of continental, as well as very many English, theologians who still pretend to a certain orthodoxy, either to explain the miracles of the Gospel naturally, or to suppress them altogether. Since Schleiermacher denounced the idea of Divine interuptions of the order of nature, and explained away the supernatural character of miracles, by defining them as merely relative—miracles to us, but in reality mere anticipations of human knowledge and power—his example has been more or less followed throughout Germany, and almost every expedient has been adopted by would-be orthodox writers to reduce, or altogether eliminate, the miraculous elements. The attempts which have been made to do this, and yet to maintain the semblance of unshaken belief in the main points of ecclesiastical Christianity, have lamentably failed, from the hopeless nature of the task and the fundamental error of the conception. The endeavour of Paulus and his school to get rid of the supernatural by a bold naturalistic interpretation of the language of the Gospel naratives, whilst the credibility of the record was represented as intact, was too glaring an outrage upon common sense to be successful; but it was scarcely more illogical than subsequent efforts to suppress the

[1] Newman writes: "Nay, if we only go so far as to realise what Christianity is, when considered merely as a creed, and what stupendous overpowering facts are involved in the doctrine of a Divine Incarnation, we shall feel that no miracle can be great after it, nothing strange or marvellous, nothing beyond expectation" (*Two Essays on Scripture Miracles*, etc., 1870, p. 185).

miraculous, yet retain the creed. The great majority of modern German critics, however, reject the miraculous altogether, and consider the question as no longer worthy of discussion; and most of those who have not distinctly expressed this view either resort to every linguistic device to evade the difficulty, or betray by their hesitation the feebleness of their belief.[1] In dealing with the question of miracles, therefore, it is not to Germany we must turn, but to England, where their reality is still maintained.

Archbishop Trench rejects with disdain the attempts of Schleiermacher and others to get rid of the miraculous elements of miracles, by making them relative, which he rightly considers to be merely "a decently veiled denial of the miracle altogether";[2] and he will not accept any reconciliation which sacrifices the miracle, "which," he logically affirms, "is, in fact, no miracle, if it lay in nature already, if it was only the evoking of forces latent therein, not a new thing, not the bringing in of the novel powers of a higher world; if the mysterious processes and powers by which those works were brought about had been only undiscovered hitherto, and not undiscoverable, by the efforts of human inquiry."[3] When Dr. Trench tries to define what he considers

[1] It may be well to refer more particularly to the views of Ewald, one of the most profound scholars, but, at the same time, arbitrary critics, of this time. In his great work, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, he rejects the supernatural from all the "miracles" of the Old Testament (cf. III. Ausg. 1864, Band i., p. 385 ff., ii., p. 88 f., 101 ff., 353 ff.), and in the fifth volume *Christus u.s. Zeit*, he does not belie his previous opinions. He deliberately repudiates the miraculous birth of Jesus (v. p. 236), rejects the supernatural from the birth of John the Baptist, and denies the relationship (Luke i. 36) between him and Jesus (p. 230 ff.). The miraculous events at the Crucifixion are mere poetical imaginations (p. 581). The Resurrection is the creation of the pious longing and excited feeling of the disciples (Band vi. *Gesch. des Apost. Zeitalters*, 1858, p. 71 f.), and the Ascension, its natural sequel (vi. p. 95 f.). In regard to the miracles of Jesus, his treatment of disease was principally mental and by the exercise of moral influence on the mind of the sick; but he also employed external means, inquired into the symptoms of disease, and his action was subject to the laws of Divine order (v. pp. 291–299). Ewald spiritualises the greater miracles until the physical basis is almost completely lost. In the miracle at the marriage of Cana, "water itself, under the influence of his spirit, becomes the best wine," as it still does wherever his spirit is working in full power (v. p. 329). The miraculous feeding of 5,000 is a narrative based on some tradition of an occasion in which Jesus, "with the smallest external means, but infinitely more through his spirit and word and prayer, satisfied all who came to him"—an allegory, in fact, of the higher satisfying power of the bread of life—which in course of time grew to the consistency of a physical miracle (v. p. 442). The raising of the son of the widow of Nain is represented as a case of suspended animation (v. p. 424). In his latest work, *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, Ewald eliminates all the miraculous elements from Revelation, which he extends to all historical religions (with the exception of Mohammedanism), as well as to the religion of the Bible (i., p. 18, § 8).

[2] *Notes on Miracles*, p. 74.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 75.

the real character of miracles, however, he becomes, as might be expected, voluminous and obscure. He says: "An extraordinary Divine casualty, and not that ordinary which we acknowledge everywhere, and in everything, belongs, then, to the essence of the miracle; powers of God other than those which have always been working; such, indeed, as most seldom or never have been working before. The unresting activity of God, which at other times hides and conceals itself behind the veil of what we term natural laws, does in the miracle unveil itself; it steps out from its concealment, and the hand which works is laid bare. Beside and beyond the ordinary operation of nature, higher powers (higher, not as coming from a higher source, but as bearing upon higher ends) intrude and make themselves felt even at the very springs and sources of her power."[1] "Not, as we shall see the greatest theologians have always earnestly contended, *contra* naturam, but *præter* naturam, and *supra* naturam."[2] Further on he adds: "*Beyond* nature, *beyond* and *above* the nature which we know, they are, but not *contrary* to it."[3] Newman, in a similar strain, though with greater directness, says: "The miracles of Scripture are undeniably beyond nature"; and he explains them as "wrought by persons consciously exercising, under Divine guidance, a power committed to them for definite ends, professing to be immediate messengers from heaven, and to evidencing their mission by their miracles."[4]

Miracles are here described as "beside," and "beyond," and "above" nature; but a moment's consideration must show that, in so far as these terms have any meaning at all, they are simply evasions, not solutions, of a difficulty. Dr. Trench is quite sensible of the danger in which the definition of miracles places them, and how fatal to his argument it would be to admit that they are contrary to the order of nature. "The miracle," he protests, "is not thus *unnatural;* nor could it be such, since the unnatural, the contrary to order, is of itself the ungodly, and can in no way, therefore, be affirmed of a Divine work, such as that with which we have to do."[5] The Archbishop, in this, however, is clearly arguing from nature to miracles, and not from miracles to nature. He does not, of course, know what miracles really are; but, as he recognises that the order of nature must be maintained, he is forced to assert that miracles are not contrary to nature. He repudiates the idea of their being natural phenomena, and yet attempts to deny that they are unnatural. They must either be the one or the other. Indeed, that his distinction is purely

[1] *Notes on Miracles*, p. 12. [2] *Ib.*, p. 12, note 2. [3] *Ib.*, p. 14.
[4] *Two Essays on Scripture Miracles*, etc., p. 116.
[5] *Notes on Miracles*, p. 15.

imaginary, and inconsistent with the alleged facts of Scriptural miracles, is apparent from Dr. Trench's own illustrations. The whole argument is a mere quibble of words to evade a palpable dilemma. Newman does not fall into this error, and more boldly faces the difficulty. He admits that the Scripture miracles "innovate upon the impressions which are made upon us by the order and the laws of the natural world";[1] and that "walking on the sea, or the resurrection of the dead, is a plain reversal of its laws."[2]

Take, for instance, the multiplication of loaves and fishes. Five thousand people are fed upon five barley loaves and two small fishes; "and they took up of the fragments which remained twelve baskets full."[3] Dr. Trench is forced to renounce all help in explaining this miracle from natural analogies, and he admits: "We must simply behold in the multiplying of the bread" (and fishes?) "an act of Divine omnipotence on His part who was the Word of God—not, indeed, now as at the first, of absolute creation out of nothing, since there was a substratum to work on in the original loaves and fishes, but an act of creative accretion."[4] It will scarcely be argued by anyone that such an "act of Divine omnipotence" and "creative accretion" as this multiplication of five baked loaves and two small fishes is not contrary to the order of nature.[5] For Dr. Trench has himself pointed out that there must be interposition of man's art here, and that "a grain of wheat could never by itself, and according to the laws of natural development, issue in a loaf of bread."[6]

Undaunted by, or rather unconscious of, such contradictions, the Archbishop proceeds with his argument, and with new definitions of the miraculous. So far from being disorder of nature, he continues, with audacious precision: "The true miracle is a higher and a purer nature, coming down out of the world of untroubled harmonies into this world of ours, which so many discords have jarred and disturbed, and bringing this back again, though it be but for one mysterious prophetic moment, into harmony with that higher."[7] In that "higher and purer nature" can a grain of wheat issue in a loaf of bread? We have only to apply this theory to the miraculous multiplication of loaves and

[1] *Two Essays on Scripture Miracles*, etc., p. 154. [2] *Ib.*, p. 158.
[3] Matt. xiv. 20. [4] *Notes on Miracles*, p. 274 f.
[5] Newman, referring to this amongst other miracles as "a far greater innovation upon the economy of nature than the miracles of the Church upon the economy of Scripture," says: "There is nothing, for instance, in nature at all to parallel and mitigate the wonderful history of the multiplication of an artificially prepared substance such as bread" (*Two Essays*, p. 157 f.).
[6] *Notes on Miracles*, p. 274. [7] *Ib.*, p. 15.

fishes to perceive how completely it is the creation of Dr. Trench's poetical fancy.

These passages fairly illustrate the purely imaginary and arbitrary nature of the definitions which those who maintain the reality and supernatural character of miracles give of them. The favourite hypothesis is that which ascribes miracles to the action of unknown law. Archbishop Trench naturally adopts it. "We should see in the miracle," he says, "not the infraction of a law, but the neutralising of a lower law, the suspension of it for a time by a higher"; and he asks with indignation whence we dare conclude that, because we know of no powers sufficient to produce miracles, none exist. "They exceed the laws of *our* nature; but it does not therefore follow that they exceed the laws of *all* nature."[1] It is not easy to follow the distinction here between "*our* nature" and "*all* nature," since the order of nature, by which miracles are judged, is, so far as knowledge goes, universal, and we have no grounds for assuming that there is any other.

The same hypothesis is elaborated by Dr. Mozley. Assuming the facts of miracles, he proceeds to discuss the question of their "referribleness to unknown law," in which expression he includes both "*unknown law*, or unknown connection with *known* law."[2]

Taking first the supposition of *unknown* connection with known law, he argues that, as a law of nature, in the scientific sense, cannot possibly produce single or isolated facts, it follows that no isolated or exceptional event can come under a law of nature *by direct observation;* but, if it comes under it at all, it can only do so by some *explanation*, which takes it out of its isolation and joins it to a class of facts, whose recurrence indeed constitutes the law. Now Dr. Mozley admits that no explanation can be given by which miracles can have an unknown connection with known law.

[1] *Notes on Miracles*, p. 16. Dr. Liddon writes on the evidential purpose of miracles and their nature, as follows: "But how is man enabled to identify the Author of this law within him" (which the highest instincts of the human conscience derive from the Christian Revelation and the life of Christ), "perfectly reflected as it is in the Christ, with the Author of the law of the Universe without him? The answer is, by miracle. Miracle is an innovation upon physical law—or at least a suspension of some lower physical law by the intervention of a higher one—in the interests of moral law. The historical fact that Jesus Christ rose from the dead identifies the Lord of physical life and death with the Legislator of the Sermon on the Mount. Miracle is the certificate of identity between the Lord of Nature and the Lord of Conscience—the proof that He is really a moral being who subordinates physical to moral interests. Miracle is the meeting-point between intellect and the moral sense, because it announces the answer to the efforts and yearnings alike of the moral sense and the intellect; because it announces revelation" (*Some Elements of Religion*, Lent Lectures, 1870; H. P. Liddon, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's, 1872, p. 74 f.).

[2] *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, p. 145.

Taking the largest class of miracles, bodily cures, the correspondence between a simple command or prophetic notification and the cure is the chief characteristic of miracles, and distinguishes them from mere marvels. No violation of any law of nature takes place in either the cure or the prophetic announcement taken separately, but the two taken together are the proof of superhuman agency. He concludes that no physical hypothesis can be framed accounting for the superhuman knowledge and power involved in this class of miracles, supposing the miracles to stand as they are recorded in Scripture.[1]

The inquiry is then shifted to the other and different question: whether miracles may not be instances of laws which are as yet wholly unknown.[2] This is generally called a question of "higher law"—that is to say, a law which comprehends under itself two or more lower or less wide laws. And the principle would be applicable to miracles by supposing the existence of an unknown law, hereafter to be discovered, under which miracles would come, and then considering whether this new law of miracles and the old law of common facts might not both be reducible to a still more general law, which comprehended them both; but Dr. Mozley, of course, recognises that the discovery of such a law of miracles would necessarily involve the discovery of fresh miracles, for to talk of a law of miracles without miracles would be an absurdity.[3] The supposition of the discovery of such a law of miracles, however, would be tantamount to the supposition of a future new order of nature, from which it immediately follows that the whole supposition is irrelevant and futile as regards the present question.[4] For no new order of things could make the present order different, and a miracle, could we suppose it becoming the ordinary fact of another different order of nature, would not be less a violation of the laws of nature in the present one.[5] This explanation is also rejected.

We pause here to remark that throughout the whole inquiry into the question of miracles we meet with nothing from theologians but mere assumptions. The facts of the narrative of the miracle are first assumed, and so are the theories by which it is explained. Now, with regard to every theory which seeks to explain miracles by assumption, we may quote words applied by one of the ablest defenders of miracles to some conclusion of straw, which he placed in the mouth of an imaginary antagonist in order that he might refute it. "But the question is," said Dr. Mansel, "not whether such a conclusion has been asserted, as many other absurdities have been asserted, by the advocates of a

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, pp. 145–153.
[2] *Ib.*, pp. 153–159.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 154 f.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 156.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 157.

theory, but whether it has been established on such scientific grounds as to be entitled to the assent of all duly-cultivated minds, whatever their own consciences may say to the contrary."[1]

Immediately after his indignant demand for scientific accuracy of demonstration, Dr. Mansel proceeds to argue as follows: In the will of man we have the solitary instance of an efficient cause, in the highest sense of the term, acting among the physical causes of the material world, and producing results which could not have been brought about by any mere sequence of physical causes. If a man of his own will throw a stone into the air, its motion, as soon as it has left his hand, is determined by a combination of purely material laws; but by what *law* came it to be thrown at all? The law of gravitation, no doubt, remains constant and unbroken, whether the stone is lying on the ground or moving through the air; but all the laws of matter could not have brought about the particular result, without the interposition of the free will of the man who throws the stone. Substitute the will of God for the will of man, and the argument becomes applicable to the whole extent of creation and to all the phenomena which it embraces.[2]

It is evident that this argument merely tends to prove that every effect must have a cause—a proposition too obvious to require any argument at all. If a man had not thrown the stone, the stone would have remained lying on the ground. No one doubts this. We have here, however, this "solitary instance of an efficient cause acting among the physical causes of the material world," producing results which are wholly determined by natural laws,[3] and incapable of producing any opposed to them. If, therefore, we substitute, as Dr. Mansel desires, "the will of God" for "the will of man," we arrive at no results which are not in harmony with the order of nature. We have no ground whatever for assuming any efficient cause acting in any other way than in accordance with the laws of nature. It is, however, one of the gross fallacies of this argument, as applied to miracles, to pass from the efficient cause producing results which are strictly in accordance with natural laws, and determined by them, to an assumed efficient cause producing effects which are opposed to natural law. The restoration to life of a decomposed human body, and the miraculous multiplication of loaves and fishes, are

[1] Mansel, *Aids to Faith*, p. 19. [2] *Ib.*, p. 20.

[3] Throughout this argument we use the term "law" in its popular sense as representing the series of phenomena to which reference is made. We do not think it necessary to discuss the assumption that the will of man is an "efficient cause"; it is sufficient to show that even admitting the premiss, for the sake of argument, the supposed consequences do not follow.

opposed to natural laws, and no assumed efficient cause conceivable, to which they may be referred, can harmonise them.

Dr. Mozley continues his argument in a similar way. He inquires: "Is the suspension of physical and material laws by a spiritual being inconceivable? We reply that, however inconceivable this kind of suspension of physical law is, it is a fact. Physical laws are suspended any time an animate being moves any part of its body; the laws of matter are suspended by the laws of life."[1] He goes on to maintain that, although it is true that his spirit is united with the matter in which it moves in a way in which the Great Spirit who acts on matter in the miracle is not, yet the action of God's Spirit in the miracle of walking on the water is no more inconceivable than the action of his own spirit in holding up his own hand. "Antecedently, one step on the ground and an ascent to heaven are alike incredible. But this appearance of incredibility is answered in one case literally *ambulando*. How can I place any reliance upon it in the other?"[2] From this illustration, with a haste very unlike his previous careful procedure, he jumps to the following conclusions: "The constitution of nature, then, disproves the incredibility of the Divine suspension of physical law; but, more than this, it creates a presumption for it."[3] The laws of life of which we have experience, he argues, are themselves in an ascending scale. First come the laws which regulate unorganised matter; next the laws of vegetation; then the laws of animal life, with its voluntary motion; and, above these, again, the laws of moral being. A supposed intelligent being whose experience was limited to one or more classes in this ascending scale of laws would be totally incapable of conceiving the action of the higher classes. The progressive succession of laws is perfectly conceivable backward, but an absolute mystery forward. "Analogy," therefore, he contends, when in this ascending series we arrive at man, leads us to expect that there is a higher sphere of law as much above *him* as he is above the lower natures in the scale, and "supplies a presumption in favour of such a belief."[4] And so we arrive at the question whether there is or is not a God, a Personal Head in Nature, whose free will penetrates the universal frame invisibly to us, and is an omnipresent agent. If there be, Dr. Mozley concludes, then every miracle in Scripture is as natural an event in the universe as any chemical experiment in the physical world.[5]

This is precisely the argument of Dr. Mansel regarding the "Efficient Cause," somewhat elaborated; but, however ingeniously devised, it is equally based upon assumption and defective in

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, p. 164. [2] *Ib.*, p. 164.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 164. [4] *Ib.*, p. 165. [5] *Ib.*, p. 165.

analogy. The "classes of law" to which the Bampton lecturer refers are really in no ascending scale. Unorganised matter, vegetation, and animal life may each have special conditions modifying phenomena, but they are all equally subject to natural laws. Man is as much under the influence of gravitation as a stone is. The special operation of physical laws is not a modification of law, but law acting under different conditions. The law of gravitation suffers no alteration, whether it cause the fall of an apple or shape the orbit of a planet. The reproduction of the plant and of the animal is regulated by the same fundamental principle, acting through different organisms. The mere superiority of man over lower forms of organic and inorganic matter does not lift him above physical laws, and the analogy of every grade in nature forbids the presumption that higher forms may exist which are exempt from their control.

If in animated beings, as is affirmed, we have the solitary instance of an "efficient cause" acting among the forces of nature, and possessing the power of initiation, this "efficient cause" produces no disturbance of physical law. Its action is a recognised part of the infinite variety of form within the order of nature; and although the character of the force exercised by it may not be clearly understood, its effects are regulated by the same laws as govern all other forces in nature. If "the laws of matter are suspended by the laws of life" each time an animated being moves any part of its body, one physical law is counteracted in precisely the same manner, and to an equivalent degree, each time another physical law is called into action. The law of gravitation, for instance, is equally neutralised by the law of magnetism each time a magnet suspends a weight in the air. In each case a law is successfully resisted precisely to the extent of the force employed. The arm that is raised by the animated being falls again, in obedience to law, as soon as the force which raised it is exhausted, quite as certainly as the weight descends when the magnetic current fails. This, however, is not the suspension of law in the sense of a miracle, but, on the contrary, is simply the natural operation upon each other of co-existent laws. It is a recognised part of the order of nature,[1] and instead of rendering

[1] Dr. Mozley says, in the preface to the second edition of his *Bampton Lectures*: "It is quite true that we see laws of nature any day and any hour neutralised and counteracted in particular cases and do not look upon such counteractions as other than the most natural events; but it must be remembered that, when this is the case, the counteracting agency is as ordinary and constant an antecedent in nature as the agency which it counteracts. The agency of the muscles and the agency of the magnet are as ordinary as the agency of gravitation which they both neutralise.....The elevation of a body in the air by the force of an arm is a counteraction indeed of the law of gravitation, but it is a counteraction of it by another law as natural as that of gravity.

credible any supernatural suspension of laws, the analogy of animated beings distinctly excludes it. The introduction of life in no way changes the relation between cause and effect, which constitutes the order of nature. Life favours no presumption for the suspension of law, but, on the contrary, whilst acting in nature, universally exhibits the prevalence and invariability of law.

The supposed "Efficient Cause" is wholly circumscribed by law. It is brought into existence by the operation of physical laws, and from the cradle to the grave it is subject to those laws. The whole process of life is dependent on obedience to natural laws, and so powerless is this efficient cause to resist their jurisdiction that, in spite of its highest efforts, it pines or ceases to exist in consequence of the mere natural operation of law upon the matter with which it is united, and without which it is impotent. It cannot receive an impression from without that is not conveyed in accordance with law, and perceived by an exquisitely ordered organism, in every part of which law reigns supreme; nor can it communicate from within except through channels equally ordered by law. The "laws of life" act amongst the laws of matter, but are not independent of them, and the action of both classes of law is regulated by precisely the same principles.

Dr. Mozley's affirmation, that *antecedently* one step on the ground and an ascent to heaven are alike incredible, does not help him. In that sense it follows that there is nothing that is not antecedently incredible, nothing credible until it has happened. This argument, however, while it limits us to actual experience, prohibits presumptions with regard to that which is beyond experience. To argue that, because a step on the ground and an ascent to heaven are antecedently alike incredible, yet, as we subsequently make that step, therefore the ascent to heaven, which

The fact, therefore, is in conformity with the laws of nature. But if the same body is raised in the air without any application of a known force, it is not a fact in conformity with natural law. In all these cases the question is not whether a law of nature has been counteracted, for that does not constitute a fact contradictory to the laws of nature; but whether it has been counteracted by another natural law. If it has been, the conditions of science are fulfilled. But if a law of nature has been counteracted by a law out of nature, it is of no purpose, with a view to naturalise scientifically that counteraction of a law of nature, to say that the law of nature has been *going on* all the time, and only been neutralised, not suspended or violated. These are mere refinements of language, which do not affect the fact itself, that a new conjunction of antecedent and consequent, wholly unlike the conjunctions in nature, has taken place. The laws of nature have in that instance not worked, and an effect contrary to what would have issued from those laws has been produced. This is ordinarily called a violation or suspension of the laws of nature; and it seems an unnecessary refinement not to call it such. But whatever name we give to it, the fact is the same; and the fact is not according to the laws of nature in the scientific sense" (p. xii. f.).

we cannot make, from incredible becomes credible, is a contradiction in terms. If the ascent be antecedently incredible, it cannot at the same time be antecedently credible. That which is incredible cannot become credible because something else quite different becomes credible. Experience comes with its sober wisdom to check such reasoning. We believe in our power to walk because we habitually exercise it; we disbelieve in bodily ascensions because all experience excludes them, and if we leap into the air on the brink of a precipice, belief in an ascent to heaven is shattered to pieces at the bottom, to which the law of gravitation infallibly drags us.

There is absolutely nothing in the constitution of nature, we may say, reversing Dr. Mozley's assertion, which does not prove the incredibility of a Divine suspension of physical laws, and does not create a presumption against it. A distinction between the laws of nature and the "laws of the universe,"[1] by which he endeavours to make a miracle credible, is one which is purely imaginary. We know of no laws of the universe differing from the laws of nature. So far as human observation can range, these laws alone prevail. The occasional intervention of an unknown "efficient cause," producing the effects called "miracles"—effects which are not referrible to any known law—is totally opposed to experience, and such a hypothesis to explain alleged occurrences of a miraculous character cannot find a legitimate place within the order of nature.

The proposition with which Dr. Mozley commences these Bampton Lectures, and for which he contends to their close, is this: "That miracles, or visible suspensions of the order of nature for a providential purpose, are not in contradiction to reason."[2] He shows that the purpose of miracles is to attest a supernatural revelation, which, without them, we could not be justified in believing. "Christianity," he distinctly states, "cannot be maintained as a revelation undiscoverable by human reason—a revelation of a supernatural scheme for man's salvation without the evidence of miracles."[3] Out of this very admission he attempts to construct an argument in support of miracles. "Hence it follows," he continues, "that, upon the supposition of the Divine design of a revelation, a miracle is not an anomaly or irregularity, but part of the system of the universe; because, though an irregularity and an anomaly in relation to either part, it has a complete adaptation to the whole. There being two worlds, a visible and invisible, and a communication between the

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, p. 163.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 6. [3] *Ib.*, p. 23.

two being wanted, a miracle is the instrument of that communication."[1]

This argument is based upon mere assumption. The supposition of the Divine design of a revelation, by which a miracle is said to become "part of the system of the universe" and, therefore, neither an "anomaly" nor "irregularity," is the result of a foregone conclusion in its favour, and is not suggested by antecedent probability. It is, in fact, derived solely from the contents of the revelation itself. Divines assume that a communication of this nature is in accordance with reason, and was necessary for the salvation of the human race, simply because they believe that it took place. No attempt is seriously made, independently, to prove the reality of the supposed "Divine design of a revelation." A revelation having, it is supposed, been made, that revelation is consequently supposed to have been contemplated, and to have necessitated and justified suspensions of the order of nature to effect it. The proposition for which the evidence of miracles is demanded is viciously employed as evidence for miracles.

The circumstances upon which the assumption of the necessity and reasonableness of a revelation is based, however, are incredible, and contrary to reason. We are asked to believe that God made man in his own image, pure and sinless, and intended him to continue so, but that scarcely had this, his noblest work, left the hands of the Creator than man was tempted into sin by Satan, an all-powerful and persistent enemy of God, whose existence and antagonism to a Being in whose eyes sin is abomination are not accounted for, and are incredible.[2] Adam's fall brought a curse upon the earth, and incurred the penalty of death for himself and for the whole of his posterity. The human race, although created perfect and without sin, thus disappointed the expectations of the Creator, and became daily more wicked, the Evil Spirit having succeeded in frustrating the designs of the Almighty, so that God repented that he had made man, and at length destroyed by a deluge all the inhabitants of the earth, with the exception of eight persons who feared him. This sweeping purification, however, was as futile as the original design, and the race of men soon became more wicked than ever. The final and only adequate remedy devised by God for the salvation of his creatures, become so desperately and hopelessly evil, was the incarnation of himself in the person of "the Son," the second

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, p. 23.

[2] The history of the gradual development of the idea of the existence and personality of the Devil is full of instruction, and throws no small light upon the question of revelation.

person in a mysterious Trinity, of which the Godhead is said to be composed (who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary), and his death upon the cross as a vicarious expiation of the sins of the world, without which supposed satisfaction of the justice of God his mercy could not possibly have been extended to the frail and sinful work of his own hands. The crucifixion of the incarnate God was the crowning guilt of a nation whom God himself had selected as his own peculiar people, and whom he had condescended to guide by constant direct revelations of his will, but who, from the first, had displayed the most persistent and remarkable proclivity to sin against him, and, in spite of the wonderful miracles wrought on their behalf, to forsake his service for the worship of other gods. We are asked to believe, therefore, in the frustration of the Divine design of creation, and in the fall of man into a state of wickedness hateful to God, requiring and justifying the Divine design of a revelation, and such a revelation as this, as a preliminary to the further proposition that, on the supposition of such a design, miracles would not be contrary to reason.

The whole theory of this abortive design of creation, with such impotent efforts to amend it, is emphatically contradicted by all that experience has taught us of the order of nature. It is difficult to say whether the details of the scheme or the circumstances which are supposed to have led to its adoption are more shocking to reason or to moral sense. The imperfection ascribed to the Divine work is scarcely more derogatory to the power and wisdom of a Creator than the supposed satisfaction of his justice in the death of himself incarnate, the innocent for the guilty, is degrading to the idea of his moral perfection. The supposed necessity for repeated interference to correct the imperfection of the original creation, the nature of the means employed, and the triumphant opposition of Satan are anthropomorphic conceptions totally incompatible with the idea of an infinitely wise and Almighty Being. The constitution of nature, so far from favouring any hypothesis of original perfection and subsequent deterioration, bears everywhere the record of systematic upward progression. Not only is the assumption that any revelation of the nature of ecclesiastical Christianity was necessary excluded upon philosophical grounds, but it is contradicted by the whole operation of natural laws, which contain in themselves inexorable penalties against retrogression, or even unprogressiveness, and furnish the only requisite stimulus to improvement. The survival only of the fittest is the stern decree of nature. The invariable action of law of itself eliminates the unfit. Progress is necessary to existence; extinction is the doom of retrogression. The highest effect contemplated by the supposed revelation is to bring man

into perfect harmony with law; but this is ensured by law itself acting upon intelligence. Civilisation is nothing but the knowledge and observance of natural laws. The savage must learn these laws or be extinguished; the cultivated must observe them or die. The balance of moral and physical development cannot be deranged with impunity. In the spiritual as well as the physical sense, only the fittest eventually can survive in the struggle for existence. There is, in fact, an absolute upward impulse to the whole human race supplied by the invariable operation of the laws of nature, acting upon the common instinct of self-preservation. As, on the one hand, the highest human conception of infinite wisdom and power is derived from the universality and invariability of law; so that universality and invariability, on the other hand, exclude the idea of interruption or occasional suspension of law for any purpose whatever, and more especially for the correction of supposed original errors of design which cannot have existed, or for the attainment of objects already provided for in the order of nature.

Upon the first groundless assumption of a Divine design of such a revelation follows the hypothetical inference that, for the purpose of making the communication from the unseen world, a miracle or visible suspension of the order of nature is no irregularity, but part of the system of the universe. This, however, is a mere assertion, and no argument. An avowed assumption which is contrary to reason is followed by another which is contrary to experience. It is not permissible to speak of a visible suspension of the order of nature being part of the system of the universe. Such a statement has no meaning whatever within the range of human conception. Moreover, it must be remembered that miracles—or "visible suspensions of the order of nature"—are ascribed indifferently to Divine and to Satanic agency. If miracles are not an anomaly or irregularity on the supposition of the Divine design of a revelation, upon what supposition do Satanic miracles cease to be irregularities? Is the order of nature, which it is asserted is under the personal control of God, at the same time at the mercy of the Devil?

Archbishop Trench has, as usual, a singular way of overcoming the difficulty. He says: "So long as we abide in the region of nature, miraculous and improbable, miraculous and incredible, may be admitted as convertible terms. But once lift up the whole discussion into a higher region, once acknowledge something higher than nature, a kingdom of God, and men the intended denizens of it, and the whole argument loses its strength and the force of its conclusions.....He who already counts it likely that God will interfere for the higher welfare of men, who believes that there is a nobler world-order than that in which we live and move, and

that it would be the blessing of blessings for that nobler to intrude into and to make itself felt in the region of this lower, who has found that here in this world we are bound by heavy laws of nature, of sin, of death, which no powers that we now possess can break, yet which must be broken if we are truly to live—he will not find it hard to believe the great miracle, the coming of the Son of God in the flesh, &c.....And as he believes that greatest miracle, so will he believe all other miracles, etc."[1] In other words, if we already believe the premisses we shall not find it difficult to adopt the conclusions—if we already believe the greatest miracle we shall not hesitate to believe the less—if we already believe the dogmas we shall not find it hard to believe the evidence by which they are supposed to be authenticated. As we necessarily do abide in the region of nature, in which Dr. Trench admits that miraculous and incredible are convertible terms, it would seem rather difficult to lift the discussion into the higher region here described without having already abandoned it altogether.

[1] *Notes on Miracles*, p. 71 f. Archbishop Trench believes that exemption from the control of the law of gravitation, etc., is a "lost prerogative" of our race, which we may one day recover. It would be difficult to produce a parallel to his reasoning in modern times. He says: "It has been already observed that the miracle, according to its true idea, is not a violation nor yet suspension of law, but the incoming of a higher law, as of a spiritual in the midst of natural laws, and the momentary assertion, for that higher law, of the predominance which it was intended to have, and but for man's fall it would always have had, over the lower; and with this a prophetic anticipation of the abiding prevalence which it shall one day recover. Exactly thus was there here" (in the miracle of the Walking on the Sea) "a sign of the lordship of man's will, when that will is in absolute harmony with God's will, over external nature. In regard to this very law of gravitation, a feeble, and for the most part unconsciously possessed, remnant of his power survives to man in the well-attested fact that his body is lighter when he is awake than sleeping; a fact which every nurse who has carried a child can attest. From this we conclude that the human consciousness, as an inner centre, works as an opposing force to the attraction of the earth and the centripetal force of gravity, however unable now to overbear it" (!) *Ib.*, p. 292.

CHAPTER III.

REASON IN RELATION TO THE ORDER OF NATURE

THE argument of those who assert the possibility and reality of miracles generally takes the shape of an attack, more or less direct, upon our knowledge of the order of nature. To establish an exception they contest the rule. "Whatever difficulty there is in believing in miracles in general," he says, "arises from the circumstance that they are in contradiction to or unlike the order of nature. To estimate the force of this difficulty, then, we must first understand what kind of belief it is which we have in the order of nature; for the weight of the objection to the miraculous must depend on the nature of the belief to which the miraculous is opposed."[1] Dr. Mozley defines the meaning of the phrase, "order of nature," as the *connection* of that part of the order of nature of which we are ignorant with that part of which we know, the former being expected to be such and such, *because* the latter is. But how do we justify this expectation of *likeness*?[2] We cannot do so, he affirms, and all our arguments are mere statements of the belief itself, and not reasons to account for it. It may be said, *e.g.*, that when a fact of nature has gone on repeating itself a certain time, such repetition shows that there is a permanent cause at work, and that a permanent cause produces permanently recurring effects. But what is there, he inquires, to show the existence of a permanent cause? Nothing. The effects which have taken place show a cause at work to the extent of these effects, but not further. That this cause is of a more permanent nature we have no evidence. Why, then, do we expect the further continuance of these effects?[3] We can only say: because we believe the future will be like the past. After a physical phenomenon has even occurred every day for years we have nothing but the past repetition to justify our certain expectation of its future repetition.[4] Do we think it giving a reason for our confidence in the future to say that, though no man has had experience of what *is* future, every man has had experience of what *was* future? It is true, he admits, that what *is* future becomes at every step of our advance what *was* future, but that

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, p. 33. [2] *Ib.*, p. 34.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 36. [4] *Ib.*, p. 37.

which is now *still* future is not the least altered by that circumstance; it is as invisible, as unknown, and as unexplored as if it were the very beginning and the very starting-point of nature. At this starting-point of nature what would a man know of its future course? Nothing. At this moment he *knows* no more.[1] What ground of reason, then, can we assign for our expectation that any part of the course of nature will the *next* moment be like what it has been up to *this* moment—*i.e.*, for our belief in the uniformity of nature? None. It is without a reason. It rests upon no rational ground, and can be traced to no rational principle.[2] The belief in the order of nature being thus an "unintelligent impulse" of which we cannot give any rational account, Dr. Mozley concludes, the ground is gone upon which it could be maintained that miracles, as opposed to the order of nature, were opposed to reason. A miracle, then, in being opposed to our experience is not only not opposed to necessary reasoning, but to any reasoning.[3] We need not further follow the Bampton Lecturer, as, with clearness and ability, he applies this reasoning to the argument of "Experience," until he pauses triumphantly to exclaim: "Thus, step by step, has philosophy loosened the connection of the order of nature with the ground of reason, befriending in exact proportion, as it has done this, the principle of miracles."[4]

We need not here enter upon any abstract argument regarding the permanence of cause: it will be sufficient to deal with these objections in a simpler and more direct way. Dr. Mozley, of course, acknowledges that the principle of the argument from experience is that "which makes human life practicable; which utilises all our knowledge; which makes the past anything more than an irrelevant picture to us; for of what use is the experience of the past to us unless we believe the future will be like it?"[5] Our knowledge in all things is relative, and there are sharp and narrow limits to human thought. It is, therefore, evident that, in the absence of absolute knowledge, our belief must be accorded to that of which we have more full cognizance, rather than to that which is contradicted by all that we do know. It may be "irrational" to feel entire confidence that the sun will "rise" to-morrow, or that the moon will continue to wax and wane as in the past, but we shall without doubt retain this belief, and reject any assertion, however positive, that the earth will stand still to-morrow, or that it did so some thousands of years ago. Evidence must take its relative place in the finite scale of knowledge and thought, and if we do not absolutely know anything, so long as one thing is more fully established than another, we must hold to that

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, p. 38. [2] *Ib.*, p. 39. [3] *Ib.*, p. 48.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 49. [5] *Ib.*, p. 58.

which rests upon the more certain basis. Our belief in the invariability of the order of nature, therefore, being based upon more certain grounds than any other human opinion, we must of necessity refuse credence to a statement supported by infinitely less complete testimony, and contradicted by universal experience, that phenomena subversive of that order occurred many years ago, or we must cease to believe anything at all. If belief based upon unvarying experience be irrational, how much more irrational must belief be which is opposed to that experience. According to Dr. Mozley, it is quite irrational to believe that a stone dropped from the hand, for instance, will fall to the ground. It is true that all the stones we ourselves have ever dropped, or seen dropped, have so fallen, and equally true that all stones so dropped as far back as historic records, and those still more authentic and ancient records of earth's crust itself, go, have done the same; but that, he contends, does not justify our belief, upon any grounds of reason, that the next stone we drop will do so. If we be told, however, that upon one occasion a stone so dropped, instead of falling to the ground, rose up into the air and continued there, we have only two courses open to us: either to disbelieve the fact, and attribute the statement to error of observation, or to reduce the past to a mere irrelevant picture, and the mind to a blank page equally devoid of all belief and of all intelligent reasoning.

Dr. Mozley's argument, however, is fatal to his own cause. It is admitted that miracles, "or visible suspensions of the order of nature,"[1] cannot have any evidential force unless they be supernatural, and out of the natural sequence of ordinary phenomena. Now, unless there be an actual order of nature, how can there be any exception to it? If our belief in it be not based upon any ground of reason—as he maintains, in order to assert that miracles or visible suspensions of that order are not contrary to reason—how can it be asserted that miracles are supernatural? If we have no rational ground for believing that the future will be like the past, what rational ground can we have for thinking that anything which happens is exceptional, and out of the common course of nature? Because it has not happened before? That is no reason whatever; because, according to his contention, the fact that a thing has happened ten millions of times is no rational justification of our expectation that it will happen again. If the reverse of that which had happened previously took place on the ten million and first time, we should, therefore, have no rational ground for surprise, and no reason for affirming that it did not occur in the most natural manner. Because we cannot explain its

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, p. 6.

cause? We cannot explain the cause of anything. Our belief that there is any permanent cause is, according to him, a mere unintelligent impulse; we can only say that there is a cause sufficient to produce an isolated effect, but we do not know the nature of that cause, and it is a mere irrational instinct to suppose that any cause produces continuous effects, or is more than momentary. A miracle, consequently, becomes a mere isolated effect from an unknown cause, in the midst of other merely isolated phenomena from unknown causes, and it is as irrational to wonder at the occurrence of what is new as to expect the recurrence of what is old. In fact, an order of nature is at once necessary, and fatal, to miracles. If there be no order of nature, miracles cannot be considered supernatural occurrences, and have no evidential value; if there be an order of nature, the evidence for its immutability must consequently exceed the evidence for these isolated deviations from it. If we are unable rationally to form expectations of the future from unvarying experience in the past, it is still more irrational to call that supernatural which is merely different from our past experience. Take, for instance, the case of supposed exemption from the action of the law of gravitation, which Archbishop Trench calls "a lost prerogative of our race"[1]: we cannot, according to Dr. Mozley, rationally affirm that next week we may not be able to walk on the sea, or ascend bodily into the air. To deny this because we have not hitherto been able to do so is unreasonable; for, he maintains, it is a mere irrational impulse which expects that which has hitherto happened, when we have made such attempts, to happen again next week. If we cannot rationally deny the possibility, however, that we may be able at some future time to walk on the sea or ascend into the air, the statement that these phenomena have already occurred loses all its force, and such occurrences cease to be in any way supernatural. If, on the other hand, it would be irrational to affirm that we may next week become exempt from the operation of the law of gravitation, it can only be so by the admission that unvarying experience forbids the entertainment of such a hypothesis, and in that case it equally forbids belief in the statement that such acts ever actually took place. If we deny the future possibility on any ground of reason, we admit that we have grounds of reason for expecting the future to be like the past, and therefore contradict Dr. Mozley's conclusion; and if we cannot deny it upon any ground of reason, we extinguish the claim of such occurrences in the past to any supernatural character. Any argument which could destroy faith in the order of nature would be equally destructive to miracles. If we have

[1] *Notes on Miracles*, p. 32 f., p. 291 f.

no right to believe in a rule, there can be no right to speak of exceptions. The result in any case is this, that whether the principle of the order of nature be established or refuted, the supernatural pretensions of miracles are disallowed.

Throughout the whole of his argument against the rationality of belief in the order of nature, the rigorous precision which Dr. Mozley unrelentingly demands from his antagonists is remarkable. They are not permitted to deviate by a hair's breadth from the line of strict logic, and the most absolute exactness of demonstration is required. Anything like an assumption or argument from analogy is excluded; induction is allowed to add no reason to bare and isolated facts; and the belief that the sun will rise to-morrow morning is, with pitiless severity, written down as mere unintelligent impulse. Belief in the return of day, based upon the unvarying experience of all past time, is declared to be without any ground of reason. We find anything but fault with strictness of argument; but it is fair that equal precision should be observed by those who assert miracles, and that assumption and inaccuracy should be excluded. Hitherto, as we have frequently pointed out, we have met with very little, or nothing, but assumption in support of miracles; but, encouraged by the inflexible spirit of Dr. Mozley's attack upon the argument from experience, we may look for similar precision from himself.

Proceeding, however, from his argument against the rationality of belief in the order of nature to his more direct argument for miracles, we are astonished to find a total abandonment of the rigorous exactness imposed upon his antagonists, and a complete relapse into assumptions. Dr. Mozley does not conceal the fact. "The peculiarity of the argument of miracles," he frankly admits, "is that it begins and ends with an assumption; I mean relatively to that argument."[1] Such an argument is no argument at all; it is a mere *petitio principii*, incapable of proving anything. The nature of the assumptions obviously does not in the slightest degree affect this conclusion. It is true that the statement of the particular assumptions may constitute an appeal to belief otherwise derived, and evolve feelings which may render the calm exercise of judgment more difficult; but the fact remains absolute, that an argument which "begins and ends with an assumption" is totally impotent. It remains an assumption, and is not an argument at all.

Notwithstanding this unfortunate and disqualifying "peculiarity," we may examine the argument. It is as follows: "We assume the existence of a Personal Deity prior to the proof of miracles

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, p. 94.

in the religious sense; but with this assumption the question of miracles is at an end, because such a Being has necessarily the power to suspend those laws of nature which He has Himself enacted."[1] The "question of miracles," which Dr. Mozley here asserts to be at an end on the assumption of a "Personal Deity," is, of course, merely that of the *possibility* of miracles; but it is obvious that, even with the precise definition of Deity which is assumed, instead of the real "question" being at an end, it only commences. The power to suspend the laws of nature being assumed, the will to suspend them has to be demonstrated as also the actual occurrence of any such assumed suspension, which is contrary to reason. The subject is, moreover, complicated by the occurrence of Satanic as well as Divine suspensions of the order of nature, and by the necessity of assuming a Personal Devil as well as a Personal Deity, and his power to usurp that control over the laws of nature which is assumed as the prerogative of the Deity, and to suspend them in direct opposition to God. Even Newman has recognised this, and, in a passage already quoted, he says: "For the cogency of the argument from miracles depends on the assumption that interruptions in the course of nature must ultimately proceed from God; which is not true if they may be effected by other beings without His sanction."[2] The first assumption, in fact, leads to nothing but assumptions connected with the unseen, unknown, and supernatural, which are beyond the limits of reason.

Dr. Mozley is well aware that his assumption of a "Personal" Deity is not susceptible of proof;[3] indeed, this is admitted in the statement that the definition is an "assumption." He quotes the obvious reply which may be made regarding this assumption: "Everybody must collect from the harmony of the physical universe the existence of a God, but in acknowledging a God we do not thereby acknowledge this peculiar doctrinal conception of a God. We see in the structure of nature a mind—a universal mind—but still a mind which only operates and expresses itself by law. Nature only does and only can inform us of mind *in* nature, the partner and correlative of organised matter. Nature, therefore, can speak to the existence of a God in this sense, and can speak to the omnipotence of God in a sense coinciding with the actual

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, p. 94. [2] *Two Essays*, etc., p. 50.

[3] Dr. Westcott frankly admits this. "Christianity, therefore," he says, "as the absolute religion of man, assumes as its foundation the existence of an Infinite Personal God and a finite human will. This antithesis is assumed, and not proved. No arguments can establish it. It is a primary intuition, and not a deduction. It is capable of illustration from what we observe around us; but if either term is denied no reasoning can establish its truth" (*The Gospel of the Resurrection*, 3rd ed., 1874, p. 19 f.).

facts of nature; but in no other sense does nature witness to the existence of an Omnipotent Supreme Being. Of a universal mind out of nature, nature says nothing, and of an Omnipotence which does not possess an inherent limit in nature, she says nothing either. And, therefore, that conception of a Supreme Being which represents him as a Spirit independent of the physical universe, and able from a standing-place external to nature to interrupt its order, is a conception of God for which we must go elsewhere. That conception is obtained from revelation, which is asserted to be proved by miracles. But that being the case, this doctrine of Theism rests itself upon miracles, and, therefore, miracles cannot rest upon this doctrine of Theism."[1] With his usual fairness, Dr. Mozley, while questioning the correctness of the premiss of this argument, admits that, if established, the consequence stated would follow, "and more, for miracles, being thrown back upon the same ground on which Theism is, the whole evidence of revelation becomes a vicious circle, and the fabric is left suspended in space, revelation resting on miracles, and miracles resting on revelation."[2] He not only recognises, however, that the conception of a "Personal" Deity cannot be proved, but he distinctly confesses that it was obtained from revelation,[3] and from nowhere else, and these necessary admissions obviously establish the correctness of the premiss, and involve the consequence pointed out, that the evidence of revelation is a mere vicious circle. Dr. Mozley attempts to argue that, although the idea was first obtained through this channel, "the truth once possessed is seen to rest upon grounds of natural reason."[4] The argument by which he seeks to show that the conception is seen to rest upon grounds of natural reason is: "We naturally attribute to the design of a Personal Being a contrivance which is directed to the existence of a Personal Being..... From personality at one end I infer personality at the other." Dr. Mozley's own sense of the weakness of his argument, however, and his natural honesty of mind oblige him continually to confess the absence of evidence. A few paragraphs further on he admits: "Not, however, that the existence of a God is so clearly seen by reason as to dispense with faith";[5] but he endeavours to convince us that faith is reason, only reason acting under peculiar circumstances: when reason draws conclusions which are not backed by experience, reason is then called faith.[6] The issue of the argument, he contends, is so amazing that if we do not tremble for its safety it must be on account of a practical principle, which makes us confide and trust in reasons,

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, p. 95 f.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 96. [3] *Ib.*, p. 97 f. [4] *Ib.*, p. 99.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 100. [6] *Ib.*, p. 101.

and that principle is faith. We are not aware that conviction can be arrived at regarding any matter otherwise than by confidence in the correctness of the reasons, and what Dr. Mozley really means by faith here is confidence and trust in a conclusion for which there are no reasons.

It is almost incredible that the same person who had just been denying grounds of reason to conclusions from unvarying experience, and excluding from them the results of inductive reasoning—who had denounced as unintelligent impulse and irrational instinct the faith that the sun, which has risen without fail every morning since time began, will rise again to-morrow, could thus argue. In fact, from the very commencement of the direct plea for miracles calm logical reasoning is abandoned, and the argument becomes entirely *ad hominem*. Mere feeling is substituted for thought and, in the inability to be precise and logical, the lecturer appeals to the generally prevailing inaccuracy of thought.[1] "Faith, then," he concludes, "is *unverified* reason; reason which has not yet received the verification of the final test, but is still expectant." In science this, at the best, would be called mere "hypothesis," but accuracy can scarcely be expected where the argument continues: "Indeed, does not our heart bear witness to the fact that to believe in a God"—*i.e.*, a Personal God —"is an exercise of faith?" etc.[2]

The deduction which is drawn from the assumption of a "Personal" Deity is, as we have seen, merely the possibility of miracles. "Paley's criticism," said the late Dean of St. Paul's, "is, after all, the true one—'once believe that there is a God, and miracles are not incredible.'"[3] The assumption, therefore, although of vital importance in the event of its rejection, does not very materially advance the cause of miracles if established. We have already seen that the assumption is avowedly incapable of proof, but it may be well to examine it a little more closely in connection with the inferences supposed to be derivable from it.

In his Bampton Lectures on "The Limit of Religious Thought," delivered in 1858, Dr. Mansel, the very able editor and disciple of Sir William Hamilton, discussed this subject with great minuteness, and although we cannot pretend here to follow him through the whole of his singular argument—a theological application of Sir William Hamilton's philosophy—we must sufficiently represent it. Dr. Mansel argues: We are absolutely incapable of conceiving or proving the existence of God as he is; and so far is human reason from being able to construct a theology independent of

[1] Cf. *Bampton Lectures*, 1865, p. 101 ff.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 104.
[3] Mansel, *Aids to Faith*, p. 30.

revelation that it cannot even read the alphabet out of which that theology must be formed.[1] We are compelled by the constitution of our minds to believe in the existence of an Absolute and Infinite Being; but the instant we attempt to analyse we are involved in inextricable confusion. Our moral consciousness demands that we should conceive him as a Personality, but personality, as we conceive it, is essentially a limitation; to speak of an Absolute and Infinite Person is simply to use language to which no mode of human thought can possibly attach itself.[2] This amounts simply to an admission that our knowledge of God does not satisfy the conditions of speculative philosophy, and is incapable of reduction to an ultimate and absolute truth.[3] It is, therefore, reasonable that we should expect to find that the revealed manifestation of the Divine nature and attributes should likewise carry the marks of subordination to some higher truth, of which it indicates the existence, but does not make known the substance; and that our apprehension of the revealed Deity should involve mysteries inscrutable, and doubts insoluble by our present faculties, while at the same time it inculcates the true spirit in which doubt should be dealt with, by warning us that our knowledge of God, though revealed by himself, is revealed in relation to human faculties, and subject to the limitations and imperfections inseparable from the constitution of the human mind.[4] We need not, of course, point out that the reality of revelation is here assumed. Elsewhere, Dr. Mansel maintains that philosophy, by its own incongruities, has no claim to be accepted as a competent witness; and, on the other hand, human personality cannot be assumed as an exact copy of the Divine, but only as that which is most nearly analogous to it among finite things.[5] As we are, therefore, incapable on the one hand of a clear conception of the Divine Being, and have only analogy to guide us in conceiving his attributes, we have no criterion of religious truth or falsehood,

[1] Mansel, *Bampton Lectures*, 1858 (Murray, 4th ed., 1859), p. 40.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 56. Dr. Westcott says upon this point: "But though we appeal to the individual consciousness for the recognition of the truth of the assumptions which have been made, the language in which one term of the antithesis is expressed requires explanation. We speak of God as Infinite and Personal. The epithets involve a contradiction, and yet they are both necessary. In fact, the only approximately adequate conception which we can form of a Divine Being is under the form of a contradiction. For us, personality is only the name for special limitation exerting itself through will; and will itself implies the idea of resistance. But as applied to GOD, the notions of limitation and resistance are excluded by the antithetic term infinite" (*The Gospel of the Resurrection*, 1874, p. 21).

[3] *Ib.*, p. 94 f.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 95.

[5] Mansel, *The Philosophy of the Conditioned* (Strahan, 1866), p. 143 f.

enabling us to judge of the ways of God, represented by revelation,[1] and have no right to judge of his justice, or mercy, or goodness, by the standard of human morality.

It is impossible to conceive an argument more vicious, or more obviously warped to favour already accepted conclusions of revelation :—As finite beings, we are not only incapable of proving the existence of God, but even of conceiving him as he is ; therefore we may conceive him as he is not. To attribute personality to him is a limitation totally incompatible with the idea of an Absolute and Infinite Being, in which "we are compelled by the constitution of our minds to believe"; and to speak of him as a personality is "to use language to which no mode of human thought can possibly attach itself"; but, nevertheless, to satisfy supposed demands of our moral consciousness, we are to conceive him as a personality. Although we must define the Supreme Being as a personality, to satisfy our moral consciousness, we must not, we are told, make the same moral consciousness the criterion of the attributes of that personality. We must not suppose him to be endowed, for instance, with the perfection of morality according to our ideas of it ; but, on the contrary, we must hold that his moral perfections are at best only analogous, and often contradictory, to our standard of morality.[2] As soon as we conceive a Personal Deity to satisfy our moral consciousness, we have to abandon the personality which satisfies that consciousness, in order to accept the characteristics of a supposed revelation, to reconcile certain statements of which we must admit that we have no criterion of truth or falsehood enabling us to judge of the ways of God.

Now, in reference to the assumption of a Personal Deity as a preliminary to the proof of miracles, it must be clearly remembered that the contents of the revelation which miracles are to authenticate cannot have any weight. Antecedently, then, it is admitted that personality is a limitation which is absolutely excluded by the

[1] Mansel, *The Philosophy of the Conditioned*, (Strahan, 1866), p. 144 f. In another place Dean Mansel says: "Ideas and images which do not represent God as He is may nevertheless represent Him as it is our duty to regard Him. They are not in themselves true ; but we must nevertheless believe and act as if they were true. A finite mind can form no conception of an Infinite Being which shall be *speculatively* true, for it must represent the Infinite under finite forms ; nevertheless, a conception which is *speculatively* untrue may be *regulatively* true. A regulative truth is thus designed not to satisfy our reason, but to guide our practice ; not to tell us what God is, but how He wills that we should think of Him" (*Man's Conception of Eternity:* An examination of Mr. Maurice's Theory of a Fixed State out of Time, in a letter to the Rev. L. T. Bernays, by Rev. H. L. Mansel, B.D., p. 9 f.).

[2] *Ib.*, p. 143 f. ; *Bampton Lectures*, 1858, pp. 131–175, pp. 94–130.

ideas of the Deity which, it is asserted, the constitution of our minds compels us to form. It cannot, therefore, be rationally assumed. To admit that such a conception is false, and then to base conclusions upon it as though it were true, is inadmissible. It is child's play to satisfy our feeling and imagination by the conscious sacrifice of our reason. Moreover, Dr. Mansel admits that the conception of a Personal Deity is really derived from the revelation, which has to be rendered credible by miracles; therefore the consequence already pointed out ensues, that the assumption cannot be used to prove miracles. "It must be allowed that it is not through reasoning that men obtain the first intimation of their relation to the Deity; and that, had they been left to the guidance of their intellectual faculties alone, it is possible that no such intimation might have taken place; or, at best, that it would have been but as one guess, out of many equally plausible and equally natural."[1] The vicious circle of the argument is here again apparent, and the singular reasoning by which Dr. Mansel seeks to drive us into acceptance of revelation is really the strongest argument against it. The impossibility of conceiving God as he is,[2] which is insisted upon, instead of being a reason for assuming his personality, or for accepting Jewish conceptions of him, totally excludes such an assumption.

This "great religious assumption" is not suggested by any antecedent considerations, but is required to account for miracles, and is derived from the very revelation which miracles are to attest. "In nature and from nature," to quote words of Professor Baden Powell, "by science and by reason, we neither have, nor can possibly have, any evidence of a *Deity working* miracles; for that we must go out of nature and beyond science. If we could have any such evidence *from nature*, it could only prove extraordinary *natural* effects, which would not be *miracles* in the old theological sense, as isolated, unrelated, and uncaused; whereas no *physical* fact can be conceived as unique, or without analogy and relation to others, and to the whole system of natural causes."[3]

Dr. Mansel "does not hesitate" to affirm with Sir William Hamilton, "that the class of phenomena which requires that kind

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, 1858, p. 68.

[2] Sir William Hamilton says: "True therefore are the declarations of a pious philosophy. 'A God understood would be no God at all.' 'To think that God is as we can think Him to be is blasphemy.' The Divinity, in a certain sense, is revealed; in a certain sense is concealed: He is at once known and unknown. But the last and highest consecration of all true religion must be an altar—'Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ—'*To the unknown and unknowable God*'" (*Discussions on Philosophy*, 3rd ed., Blackwood & Sons, 1866, p. 15, note).

[3] "Study of the Evidences of Christianity," *Essays and Reviews*, 9th ed., p. 141 f.

of cause we denominate a Deity is exclusively given in the phenomena of mind; that the phenomena of matter, taken by themselves, do not warrant any inference to the existence of a God."[1] After declaring a Supreme Being, from every point of view, inconceivable by our finite minds, it is singular to find him thrusting upon us, in consequence, a conception of that Being which almost makes us exclaim with Bacon: "It were better to have no opinion of God at all than such an opinion as is unworthy of him; for the one is unbelief, the other is contumely."[2] Dr. Mansel asks: "Is matter or mind the truer image of God?"[3] But both matter and mind unite in repudiating so unworthy a conception of a God, and in rejecting the idea of suspensions of law. In the words of Spinoza: "From miracles we can neither infer the nature, the existence, nor the providence of God, but, on the contrary, these may be much better comprehended from the fixed and immutable order of nature."[4] Indeed, as he adds, miracles, as contrary to the order of nature, would rather lead us to doubt the existence of God.[5]

Six centuries before our era a noble thinker, Xenophanes of Colophon, whose pure mind soared far above the base anthropomorphic mythologies of Homer and Hesiod, and anticipated some of the highest results of the Platonic philosophy, finely said: –

> "There is one God supreme over all gods, diviner than mortals,
> Whose form is not like unto man's, and as unlike his nature;
>
> But vain mortals imagine that gods, like themselves, are begotten
> With human sensations, and voice, and corporeal members;[6]
>
> So if oxen or lions had hands, and could work in man's fashion,
> And trace out with chisel or brush their conception of Godhead,
> Then would horses depict gods like horses, and oxen like oxen,
> Each kind the Divine with its own form and nature endowing."

He illustrates this profound observation by pointing out that the Ethiopians represent their deities as black, with flat noses, while the Thracians make them blue-eyed, with ruddy complexions; and, similarly, the Medes and the Persians and Egyptians portray their gods like themselves. The Jewish idea of God was equally anthropomorphic; but their highest conception was certainly that which the least resembled themselves, and

[1] *Ib.*, p. 25. Cf. Hamilton, *Lectures on Metaphysics*, vol. i., p. 26.
[2] Bacon's *Essays*, xvii. ed. Whately, p. 183. [3] *Aids to Faith*, p. 25.
[4] *Tract, Theolog. Polit.*, c. vi., § 16, ed. Tauchnitz. [5] *Ib.*, vi., § 19.
[6] Clement of Alexandria, who quotes the whole of this passage from Xenophanes, makes a separation here from the succeeding lines, by καὶ πάλιν; but the sense is evidently continuous, and the fragments are generally united. Cf. *Clem. Al.*, Strom., v. 14, § 110.

which described the Almighty as "without variableness or shadow of turning," and as giving a law to the universe which shall not be broken.

None of the arguments with which we have yet met have succeeded in making miracles in the least degree antecedently credible. On the contrary, they have been based upon mere assumptions incapable of proof and devoid of probability. On the other hand, there are the strongest reasons for affirming that such phenomena are antecedently incredible. Dr. Mozley's attack, which we discussed in the first part of this chapter, and which, of course, was chiefly based upon Hume's celebrated argument, never seriously grappled with the doctrine at all. The principle which opposes itself to belief in miracles is very simple. Our belief in the invariability of that sequence of phenomena which we call the order of nature is based upon universal experience, and it would, therefore, require an extraordinary amount of evidence to prove the truth of any allegation of miracles, or violations of that order. Where a preponderance of evidence in support of such allegations cannot be produced, reason and experience concur in attributing the ascription of miraculous character to any occurrences said to have been witnessed, to imperfect observation, mistaken inference, or some other of the numerous sources of error. Any allegation of the interference of a new and supernatural agent, upon such an occasion, to account for results in contradiction of the known sequence of cause and effect is excluded by the very same principle, for, invariable experience being as opposed to the assertion that such interference ever takes place as it is to the occurrence of miraculous phenomena, the allegation is necessarily disbelieved.

Apologists find it much more convenient to evade the simple but effective arguments of Hume than to answer them, and where it is possible they dismiss them with a sneer, and hasten on to less dangerous ground. For instance, Dr. Farrar, arguing the antecedent credibility of the miraculous, makes the following remarks: "Now, as regards the inadequacy of testimony to establish a miracle, modern scepticism has not advanced one single step beyond the blank assertion. And it is astonishing that this assertion should still be considered cogent, when its logical consistency has been shattered to pieces by a host of writers, as well sceptical as Christian (Mill's *Logic*, ii., 157–160). For, as the greatest of our living logicians has remarked, the supposed recondite and dangerous formula of Hume—that it is more probable that testimony should be mistaken than that miracles should be true—reduces itself to the very harmless proposition that anything is incredible which is contrary to a complete induction. It is, in

fact, a flagrant *petitio principii*, used to support a wholly unphilosophical assertion."[1] It is much more astonishing that so able a man as Dr. Farrar could so misunderstand Hume's argument, and so misinterpret and misstate Mill's remarks upon it. So far from shattering to pieces the logical consistency of Hume's reasoning, Mill substantially confirms it, and pertinently remarks that "it speaks ill for the state of philosophical speculation on such subjects" that so simple and evident a doctrine should have been accounted a dangerous heresy. It is, in fact, a statement of a truth which should have been universally recognised, and would have been so but for its unwelcome and destructive bearing upon popular theology.

Mill states the evident principle: "If an alleged fact be in contradiction, not to any number of approximate generalisations, but to a completed generalisation grounded on a rigorous induction, it is said to be impossible, and is to be disbelieved totally." Mill continues: "This last principle, simple and evident as it appears, is the doctrine which, on the occasion of an attempt to apply it to the question of the credibility of miracles, excited so violent a controversy. Hume's celebrated doctrine, that nothing is credible which is contradictory to experience or at variance with laws of nature, is merely this very plain and harmless proposition, that whatever is contradictory to a complete induction is incredible."[2] He then proceeds to meet possible objections: "But does not (it may be asked) the very statement of the proposition imply a contradiction? An alleged fact, according to this theory, is not to be believed if it contradict a complete induction. But it is essential to the completeness of an induction that it should not contradict any known fact. Is it not, then, a *petitio principii* to say that the fact ought to be disbelieved because the induction to it is complete? How can we have a right to declare the induction complete, while facts, supported by credible evidence, present themselves in opposition to it? I answer, we have that right whenever the scientific canons of induction give it to us; that is, whenever the induction can be complete. We have it, for example, in a case of causation in which there has been an *experimentum crucis*." It will be remarked that Dr. Farrar adopts Mill's phraseology in one of the above questions to affirm the reverse of his opinion. Mill decides that the proposition is not a *petitio principii;* Dr Farrar says, in continuation of his reference to Mill, that it is a flagrant

[1] *The Witness of History to Christ*, Hulsean Lectures, 1870, by the Rev. F. W. Farrar, M.A., F.R.S., etc., etc., 2nd ed., 1872, p. 26 f.

[2] *A System of Logic*, by John Stuart Mill, 8th ed., 1872, ii., p. 165.

petitio principii. Mill proceeds to prove his statement, and he naturally argues that, if observations or experiments have been repeated so often, and by so many persons, as to exclude all supposition of error in the observer, a law of nature is established; and so long as this law is received as such, the assertion that on any particular occasion the cause A took place, and yet the effect B did not follow, *without any counteracting cause*, must be disbelieved. In fact, as he winds up this part of the argument by saying: "We cannot admit a proposition as a law of nature, and yet believe a fact in real contradiction to it. We must disbelieve the alleged fact, or believe that we were mistaken in admitting the supposed law."[1] Mill points out, however, that, in order that any alleged fact should be contradictory to a law of causation, the allegation must be not simply that the cause existed without being followed by the effect, but that this happened in the absence of any adequate counteracting cause. "Now, in the case of an alleged miracle, the assertion is the exact opposite of this. It is, that the effect was defeated, not in the absence, but in consequence of a counteracting cause—namely, a direct interposition of an act of the will of some being who has power over nature; and in particular of a Being whose will, being assumed to have endowed all the causes with the powers by which they produce their effects, may well be supposed able to counteract them."[2] A miracle, then, is no contradiction to the law of cause and effect; it is merely a new effect supposed to be introduced by the introduction of a new cause; "of the adequacy of that cause, *if present*,[3] there can be no doubt; and the only antecedent improbability which can be ascribed to the miracle is the improbability that any such cause existed." Mill then continues, resuming his criticism on Hume's argument: "All, therefore, which Hume has made out, and this he must be considered to have made out, is that (at least in the imperfect state of our knowledge of natural agencies, which leaves it always possible that some of the physical antecedents may have been hidden from us) no evidence can prove a miracle to any one who did not previously believe the existence of a being or beings with supernatural power; or who believes himself to have full proof that the character of the Being whom he recognises is inconsistent with his having seen fit to interfere on the occasion in question." Mill proceeds to enlarge on this conclusion. "If we do not already believe in supernatural agencies, no miracle can prove to us their existence. The miracle itself, considered merely as an extraordinary fact, may be satisfactorily certified by our senses or by testimony; but nothing

[1] Mill, *Logic*, ii., p. 166 f. [2] *Ib.*, ii., p. 167.
[3] The italics are ours.

can ever prove that it is a miracle. There is still another possible hypothesis, that of its being the result of some unknown natural cause; and this possibility cannot be so completely shut out as to leave no alternative but that of admitting the existence and intervention of a being superior to nature. Those, however, who already believe in such a being have two hypotheses to choose from, a supernatural and an unknown natural agency; and they have to judge which of the two is the most probable in the particular case. In forming this judgment, an important element of the question will be the conformity of the result to the laws of the supposed agent; that is, to the character of the Deity as they conceive it. But, with the knowledge which we now possess of the general uniformity of the course of nature, religion, following in the wake of science, has been compelled to acknowledge the government of the universe as being on the whole carried on by general laws, and not by special interpositions. To whoever holds this belief, there is a general presumption against any supposition of divine agency not operating through general laws, or, in other words, there is an antecedent improbability in every miracle which, in order to outweigh it, requires an extraordinary strength of antecedent probability derived from the special circumstances of the case."[1] Mill rightly considers that it is not more difficult to estimate this than in the case of other probabilities. "We are seldom, therefore, without the means (when the circumstances of the case are at all known to us) of judging how far it is likely that such a cause should have existed at that time and place without manifesting its presence by some other marks, and (in the case of an unknown cause) without having hitherto manifested its existence in any other instance. According as this circumstance, or the falsity of the testimony, appears more improbable, that is conflicts with an approximate generalisation of a higher order, we believe the testimony, or disbelieve it: with a stronger or weaker degree of conviction, according to the preponderance: at least until we have sifted the matter further."[2] This is precisely Hume's argument weakened by the introduction of reservations which have no cogency.

We have wished to avoid interrupting Mill's train of reasoning by any remarks of our own, and have, therefore, deferred till now the following observations regarding his criticism on Hume's argument.

In reducing Hume's celebrated doctrine to the very plain proposition, that whatever is contradictory to a complete induction is incredible, Mill in no way diminishes its potency against miracles; and he does not call that proposition "harmless" in reference to

[1] Mill, *Logic*, ii., p. 168 f. [2] *Ib.*, ii., p. 169.

its bearing on miracles, as Dr. Farrar evidently supposes, but merely in opposition to the character of a recondite and "dangerous heresy" assigned by dismayed theologians to so obvious and simple a principle. The proposition, however, whilst it reduces Hume's doctrine in the abstract to more technical terms, does not altogether represent his argument. Without asserting that experience is an absolutely infallible guide, Hume maintains that—"A wise man proportions his belief to the evidence. In such conclusions as are founded on an infallible experience, he expects the event with the last degree of assurance, and regards his past experience as a full *proof* of the future existence of that event. In other cases he proceeds with more caution; he weighs the opposite experiments; he considers which side is supported by the greater number of experiments; to that side he inclines with doubt and hesitation; and when at last he fixes his judgment, the evidence exceeds not what we properly call *probability*. All probability, then, supposes an opposition of experiments and observations, where the one side is found to overbalance the other, and to produce a degree of evidence proportioned to the superiority."[1] After elaborating this proposition, Hume continues: "A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature; and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined. Why is it more than probable that all men must die; that lead cannot, of itself, remain suspended in the air; that fire consumes wood, and is extinguished by water; unless it be that these events are found agreeable to the laws of nature, and there is required a violation of these laws, or, in other words, a miracle, to prevent them? Nothing is esteemed a miracle if it ever happened in the common course of nature. It is no miracle that a man seemingly in good health should die on a sudden; because such a kind of death, though more unusual than any other, has yet been frequently observed to happen. But it is a miracle that a dead man should come to life, because that has never been observed in any age or country. There must, therefore, be an uniform experience against every miraculous event, otherwise the event would not merit that appellation. And as an uniform experience amounts to a proof, there is here a direct and full *proof*, from the nature of the fact, against the existence of any miracle; nor can such a proof be destroyed, or the miracle rendered credible, but by an opposite proof which is superior. The plain consequence is (and it is a general maxim worthy of our attention): 'That no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle

[1] David Hume, *Philosophical Works*; Boston and Edinburgh, 1854, iv., p. 126.

unless the testimony be of such a kind that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavours to establish; and even in that case there is a mutual destruction of arguments, and the superior only gives us an assurance suitable to that degree of force which remains after deducting the inferior.' When any one tells me that he saw a dead man restored to life, I immediately consider with myself whether it be more probable that this person should either deceive or be deceived, or that the fact which he relates should really have happened. I weigh the one miracle against the other; and, according to the superiority which I discover, I pronounce my decision, and always reject the greater miracle. If the falsehood of his testimony would be more miraculous than the event which he relates, then, and not till then, can he pretend to command my belief or opinion."[1]

The ground upon which Mill admits that a miracle may not be contradictory to complete induction is that it is not an assertion that a certain cause was not followed by a certain effect, but an allegation of the interference of an adequate counteracting cause. This does not, however, by his own showing, remove a miracle from the action of Hume's principle, but simply modifies the nature of the antecedent improbability. Mill qualifies his admission regarding the effect of the alleged counteracting cause by the all-important words, "if present"; for, in order to be valid, the reality of the alleged counteracting cause must be established, which is impossible, therefore the allegations fall to the ground.

In admitting that Hume has made out that no evidence can prove a miracle to any one who does not previously believe in a being of supernatural power willing to work miracles, Mill concedes everything to Hume, for his only limitation is based upon a supposition of mere personal belief in something which is not capable of proof, and which belief, therefore, is not more valid than any other purely imaginary hypothesis. The belief may seem substantial to the individual entertaining it, but, not being capable of proof, it cannot have weight with others, or in any way affect the value of evidence in the abstract.

The assumption of a Personal Deity working miracles is excluded by Hume's argument, and, although Mill apparently overlooks the fact, Hume has not only anticipated but refuted the reasoning which is based upon it. In the succeeding chapter on a Particular Providence and a Future State he directly disposes of such an assumption, but he does so with equal effect also in the essay which we are discussing. Taking an imaginary miracle as an illustration, he argues: "Though the Being to whom the miracle is ascribed be in this case Almighty, it does not upon that account

[1] Hume, *Philos. Works*, iv., p. 130 ff.

become a whit more probable; since it is impossible for us to know the attributes or actions of such a Being otherwise than from the experience which we have of his productions in the usual course of nature. This still reduces us to past observation, and obliges us to compare the instances of the violation of truth in the testimony of men with those of the violation of the laws of nature by miracles, in order to judge which of them is most likely and probable. As the violations of truth are more common in the testimony concerning religious miracles than in that concerning any other matter of fact, this must diminish very much the authority of the former testimony, and make us form a general resolution never to lend any attention to it, with whatever specious pretence it may be covered."[1] A person who believes anything contradictory to a complete induction merely on the strength of an assumption which is incapable of proof is simply credulous; but such an assumption cannot affect the real evidence for that thing.

The argument of Paley against Hume is an illustration of the reasoning suggested by Mill. Paley alleges the interposition of a Personal Deity in explanation of miracles, but he protests that he does not assume the attributes of the Deity or the existence of a future state in order to *prove* their reality. "That reality," he admits, "always must be proved by evidence. We assert only that in miracles adduced in support of revelation there is not such antecedent improbability as no testimony can surmount." His argument culminates in the short statement: "In a word, once believe that there is a God [*i.e.*, a Personal God, working miracles], and miracles are not incredible."[2] We have already quoted Hume's refutation of this reasoning, and we may at once proceed to the final argument by which Paley endeavours to overthrow Hume's doctrine, and upon which he mainly rests his case.

"But the short consideration," he says, "which, independently of every other, convinces me that there is no solid foundation in Mr. Hume's conclusion is the following: When a theorem is proposed to a mathematician, the first thing he does with it is to try it upon a simple case, and if it produces a false result he is sure that there must be some mistake in the demonstration. Now, to proceed in this way with what may be called Mr. Hume's theorem. If twelve men, whose probity and good sense I had long known, should seriously and circumstantially relate to me an account of a miracle wrought before their eyes, and in which it was impossible that they should be deceived: if the governor of the country, hearing a rumour of this account, should call these

[1] Hume, *Philos. Works*, iv., p. 148.

[2] Paley, *A View of the Evidences of Christianity*, "Preparatory Considerations."

men into his presence, and offer them a short proposal, either to confess the imposture or submit to be tied up to a gibbet; if they should refuse with one voice to acknowledge that there existed any falsehood or imposture in the case; if this threat was communicated to them separately, yet with no different effect; if it was at last executed; if I myself saw them, one after another, consenting to be racked, burned, or strangled, rather than give up the truth of their account—still, if Mr. Hume's rule be my guide, I am not to believe them. Now, I undertake to say that there exists not a sceptic in the world who would not believe them, or who would defend such incredulity."[1]

It is obvious that this reasoning, besides being purely hypothetical, is utterly without cogency against Hume's doctrine. The evidence of the twelve men simply amounts to a statement that they saw, or fancied that they saw, a certain occurrence in contradiction to the law; but that which they actually saw was an external phenomenon, the real nature of which is a mere inference, and an inference which, from the necessarily isolated position of the miraculous phenomenon, is neither supported by other instances capable of forming a complete counter induction, nor by analogies within the order of nature.[2] The bare inference from an occurrence supposed to have been witnessed by twelve men is all that is opposed to the law of nature, which is based upon a complete induction, and it is, therefore, incredible.

If we examine Paley's "simple case" a little more closely, however, we find that not only is it utterly inadmissible as a hypothesis, but that as an illustration of the case of Gospel miracles it is completely devoid of relevancy and argumentative force. The only point which gives a momentary value to the supposed instance is the condition attached to the account of the miracle related by the twelve men, that not only was it wrought before their eyes, but that it was one "in which it was impossible that they should be deceived." Now, this qualification of infallibility on the part of the twelve witnesses is as incredible as the miracle which they are supposed to attest. The existence of twelve men incapable of error or mistake is as opposed to experience as the hypothesis of a miracle in which it is impossible for the twelve men to be deceived is contradictory to reason. The exclusion of all error in the observation of the actual occurrence and its antecedents and consequences, whose united sum constitutes the miracle, is an assumption which deprives the argument of all potency. On the other hand, the moment the possibility of error is admitted the reasoning breaks down, for the probability of error on the part of the observers, either as

[1] *Paley*, l. c. [2] Cf. Mill, *System of Logic*, ii., p. 166 f.

regards the external phenomena or the inferences drawn from them, being so infinitely greater than the probability of mistake in the complete induction, we must unquestionably reject the testimony of the twelve men.

It need scarcely be said that the assertion of liability to error on the part of the observers by no means involves any insinuation of wilful "falsehood or imposture in the case." It is quite intelligible that twelve men might witness an occurrence which might seem to them and others miraculous—but which was susceptible of a perfectly natural explanation—and truthfully relate what they believed to have seen, and that they might, therefore, refuse "with one voice to acknowledge that there existed any falsehood or imposture in the case," even although the alternative might be death on a gibbet. This, however, would in no way affect the character of the actual occurrence. It would not convert a natural, though by them inexplicable, phenomenon into a miracle. Their constancy in adhering to the account they had given would merely bear upon the truth of their own statements, and the fact of seeing them "one after another consenting to be racked, burned, or strangled, rather than give up the truth of their account," would not in the least justify our believing in a miracle. Even martyrdom cannot transform imaginations into facts. The truth of a narrative is no guarantee for the correctness of an inference.

As regards the applicability of Paley's illustration to the Gospel miracles, the failure of his analogy is complete. We shall presently see the condition of the people amongst whom these miracles are supposed to have occurred, and that, so far from the nature of the phenomena and the character of the witnesses supporting the inference that it was impossible that the observers could have been deceived, there is every reason for concluding with certainty that their ignorance of natural laws, their proneness to superstition, their love of the marvellous, and their extreme religious excitement, rendered them peculiarly liable to incorrectness in the observation of the phenomena, and to error in the inferences drawn from them. We shall likewise see that we have no serious and circumstantial accounts of those miracles from eye-witnesses of whose probity and good sense we have any knowledge, but that, on the contrary, the narratives of them which we possess were composed by unknown persons, who were not eye-witnesses at all, but wrote very long after the events related, and in that mythic period "in which reality melted into fable, and invention unconsciously trespassed on the province of history." The proposition, "That there is satisfactory evidence that many professing to be original witnesses of the Christian miracles passed their lives in labours, dangers, and sufferings, voluntarily under-

gone in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and solely in consequence of their belief of these accounts; and that they also submitted, from the same motives, to new rules of conduct," is made by Paley the argument of the first nine chapters of his work, as the converse of the proposition, that similar attestation of other miracles cannot be produced, is of the following two. This shows the importance which he attaches to the point; but, notwithstanding, even if he could substantiate this statement, the cause of miracles would not be one whit advanced.

We have freely quoted these arguments in order to illustrate the real position of miracles; and no one who has seriously considered the matter can doubt the necessity for very extraordinary evidence, even to render the report of such phenomena worthy of a moment's attention. The argument for miracles, however, has hitherto proceeded upon the merest assumption, and, as we shall further see, the utmost that they can do who support miracles, under the fatal disadvantage of being contradictory to uniform experience, is to refer to the alleged contemporaneous nature of the evidence for their occurrence, and to the character of the supposed witnesses. Mill has ably shown the serious misapprehension of so many writers against Hume's *Essay on Miracles* which has led them to what he calls "the extraordinary conclusion that nothing supported by credible testimony ought ever to be disbelieved."[1] In regard to historical facts, not contradictory to all experience, simple and impartial testimony may be sufficient to warrant belief; but even such qualities as these can go but a very small way towards establishing the reality of an occurrence which is opposed to complete induction.[2] It is admitted that the evidence requisite to establish the reality of a supernatural Divine revelation of doctrines beyond human reason, and comprising in its very essence such stupendous miracles as the Incarnation, Resurrection, and Ascension, must be miraculous. The evidence for the miraculous evidence, which is scarcely less astounding than the contents of the revelation itself, must, logically, be miraculous also, for it is not a whit more easy to prove the reality of an evidential miracle than of a dogmatic miracle. It is evident that the resurrection of Lazarus, for instance, is as contradictory to complete induction as the resurrection of Jesus. Both the supernatural religion, therefore, and its supernatural evidence labour under the fatal disability of being antecedently incredible.

[1] Mill, *Logic*, ii., pp. 173, 175.

[2] Cf. Mill, *Logic*, ii., p. 168.

CHAPTER IV.

THE AGE OF MIRACLES

Let us now, however, proceed to examine the evidence for the reality of miracles, and to inquire whether they are supported by such an amount of testimony as can in any degree outweigh the reasons which, antecedently, seem to render them incredible. It is undeniable that belief in the miraculous has gradually been dispelled, and that, as a general rule, the only miracles which are now maintained are limited to brief and distant periods of time. Faith in their reality, once so comprehensive, does not, except amongst a certain class, extend beyond the miracles of the New Testament and a few of those of the Old, and the countless myriads of ecclesiastical and other miracles, for centuries devoutly and implicitly believed, are now commonly repudiated, and have sunk into discredit and contempt. The question is inevitably suggested how so much can be abandoned and the remnant still be upheld.

As an essential part of our inquiry into the value of the evidence for miracles, we must endeavour to ascertain whether those who are said to have witnessed the supposed miraculous occurrences were either competent to appreciate them aright, or likely to report them without exaggeration. For this purpose, we must consider what was known of the order of nature in the age in which miracles are said to have taken place, and what was the intellectual character of the people amongst whom they are reported to have been performed. Nothing is more rare, even amongst intelligent and cultivated men, than accuracy of observation and correctness of report, even in matters of sufficient importance to attract vivid attention, and in which there is no special interest unconsciously to bias the observer. It will scarcely be denied, however, that in persons of fervid imagination, and with a strong natural love of the marvellous, whose minds are not only unrestrained by specific knowledge, but predisposed by superstition towards false conclusions, the probability of inaccuracy and exaggeration is enormously increased. If we add to this such a disturbing element as religious excitement, inaccuracy, exaggeration, and extravagance are certain to occur. The effect of even one of these influences, religious feeling, in warping the judgment is admitted by one of the most uncompromising supporters of

miracles. "It is doubtless the tendency of religious minds," says Newman, "to imagine mysteries and wonders where there are none; and much more, where causes of awe really exist, will they unintentionally misstate, exaggerate, and embellish, when they set themselves to relate what they have witnessed or have heard"; and he adds: "And further, the imagination, as is well known, is a fruitful cause of apparent miracles."[1] We need not offer any evidence that the miracles which we have to examine were witnessed and reported by persons exposed to the effects of the strongest possible religious feeling and excitement, and our attention may, therefore, be more freely directed to the inquiry how far this influence was modified by other circumstances. Did the Jews at the time of Jesus possess such calmness of judgment and sobriety of imagination as to inspire us with any confidence in accounts of marvellous occurrences, unwitnessed except by them, and limited to their time, which contradict all knowledge and all experience? Were their minds sufficiently enlightened and free from superstition to warrant our attaching weight to their report of events of such an astounding nature? and were they themselves sufficiently impressed with the exceptional character of any apparent supernatural and miraculous interference with the order of nature?

Let an English historian and divine, who will be acknowledged as no prejudiced witness, bear testimony upon some of these points. "Nor is it less important," says Dean Milman, "throughout the early history of Christianity, to seize the spirit of the times. Events which appear to us so extraordinary that we can scarcely conceive that they should either fail in exciting a powerful sensation or ever be obliterated from the popular remembrance, in their own day might pass off as of little more than ordinary occurrence. During the whole life of Christ, and the early propagation of the religion, it must be borne in mind that they took place in an age, and among a people, which superstition had made so familiar with what were supposed to be preternatural events that wonders awakened no emotion, or were speedily superseded by some new demand on the ever-ready belief. The Jews of that period not only believed that the Supreme Being had the power of controlling the course of nature, but that the same influence was possessed by multitudes of subordinate spirits, both good and evil. Where the pious Christian of the present day would behold the direct agency of the Almighty, the Jews would

[1] J. H. Newman, *Two Essays on Scripture Miracles and on Ecclesiastical*, 1870, p. 171. This passage occurs in a reply to the argument against admitting ecclesiastical miracles as a whole, or against admitting certain of them, that certain others are rejected on all hands as fictitious or pretended.

invariably have interposed an angel as the author or ministerial agent in the wonderful transaction. Where the Christian moralist would condemn the fierce passion, the ungovernable lust, or the inhuman temper, the Jew discerned the workings of diabolical possession. Scarcely a malady was endured, or crime committed, which was not traced to the operation of one of these myriad dæmons, who watched every opportunity of exercising their malice in the sufferings and the sins of men."[1]

Another English divine, of certainly not less orthodoxy, but of much greater knowledge of Hebrew literature, bears similar testimony regarding the Jewish nation at the same period. "Not to be more tedious, therefore, in this matter" (regarding the Bath Kol, a Jewish superstition), "let two things only be observed: (1) That the nation, under the second Temple, was given to magical arts beyond measure; and (2) That it was given to an easiness of believing all manner of delusions beyond measure."[2] And in another place: "It is a disputable case, whether the Jewish nation were more mad with superstition in matters of religion, or with superstition in curious arts:—(1) There was not a people upon earth that studied or attributed more to dreams than they. (2) There was hardly any people in the whole world that more used, or were more fond of, amulets, charms, mutterings, exorcisms, and all kinds of enchantments. We might here produce innumerable instances."[3] We shall presently see that these statements are far from being exaggerated.

No reader of the Old Testament[4] can fail to have been struck by the singularly credulous fickleness of the Jewish mind. Although claiming the title of the specially selected people of Jehovah, the Israelites exhibited a constant and inveterate tendency to forsake his service for the worship of other gods. The mighty "signs and wonders" which God is represented as incessantly working on their behalf, and in their sight, had apparently no effect upon them. The miraculous even then had, as it would seem, already lost all novelty, and ceased, according to the records, to excite more than mere passing astonishment. The leaders and prophets of Israel had a perpetual struggle to restrain

[1] *History of Christianity*, by H. H. Milman, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's; Murray, 1867, i., p. 84 f.

[2] John Lightfoot, D.D., Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge. *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, Works (ed. Pitman), xi., p. 81, cf. p. 170.

[3] *Ib.*, xi., p. 299 f. Cf. Schoettgen, *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, 1733, p. 474.

[4] We do not, of course, touch here upon the results of critical examination of the writings of the Old Testament, although these completely confirm the results of this work, but simply refer to points which bear upon our argument in the common view.

the people from "following after" heathen deities, and whilst the burden of the prophets is one long denunciation of the idolatry into which the nation was incessantly falling, the verdict of the historical books upon the several kings and rulers of Israel proves how common it was, and how rare even the nominal service of Jehovah. At the best, the mind of the Jewish nation, only after long and slow progression, attained the idea of a perfect monotheism, but added to the belief in Jehovah the recognition of a host of other gods, over whom it merely gave him supremacy.[1] This is apparent even in the first commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me"; and the necessity for such a law received its illustration from a people who are represented as actually worshipping the golden calf, made for them by the complaisant Aaron, during the very time that the great Decalogue was being written on the Mount by his colleague Moses.[2] It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that at a later period, and throughout patristic days, the gods of the Greeks and other heathen nations were so far gently treated that, although repudiated as deities, they were recognised as demons. In the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, where "idols" are spoken of in the Hebrew, the word is sometimes translated "demons"; as, for instance, Psalm xcvi. 5 is rendered: "For all the gods of the nations are demons."[3] The same superstition is quite as clearly expressed in the New Testament. The Apostle Paul, for instance, speaking of things sacrificed to idols, says: "But (I say) that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, and not to God; and I would not that ye should be partakers with demons. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of demons; ye cannot partake of the Lord's table, and of the table of demons."[4]

The apocryphal Book of Tobit affords some illustration of the opinions of the more enlightened Jews during the last century

[1] This is unconsciously expressed throughout the Bible in such passages as Deut. x. 17: "For the Lord your God is God of gods, and Lord of lords, a great God, a mighty and a terrible," etc. (cf. Joshua xxii. 22, Deut. xi. 28, xii. 2 ff., Ps. lxxxix. 6, 7, and a host of other passages).

[2] An admirable inquiry into the religion of the Jewish nation is to be found in Dr. A. Kuenen's very able work, *De Godsdienst van Israël*, Haarlem. Eerste deel, 1869; tweede deel, 1870.

[3] "Ὅτι πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν δαιμόνια (Ps. xcv. 5, Sept.). This is not to be wondered at, when in so many other passages the Israelites are represented in the Hebrew as sacrificing to devils when they worshipped other gods: cf. Levit. xvii. 7; Deut. xxxii. 17; Ps. cvi. (Sept. cv.) 37. In Isaiah lxv. 11 the words translated in the English version "that prepare a table for that troop" are referred to demons in the Septuagint: καὶ ἑτοιμάζοντες τῷ δαιμονίῳ τράπεζαν. In Ps. xcvii. 7 the word translated "gods" in the English version becomes ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ in the Sept. (xcvi. 7).

[4] 1 Cor. x. 20.

before the commencement of the Christian era.[1] The angel Raphael prescribes, as an infallible means of driving a demon out of man or woman so effectually that it should never more come back, fumigation with the heart and liver of a fish.[2] By this exorcism the demon Asmodeus, who, from love of Sara, the daughter of Raguel, has strangled seven husbands who attempted to marry her,[3] is overcome, and flies into "the uttermost parts of Egypt," where the angel binds him.[4] The belief in demons, and in the necessity of exorcism, is so complete that the author sees no incongruity in describing the angel Raphael, who has been sent, in answer to prayer, specially to help him, as instructing Tobias to adopt such means of subjecting demons. Raphael is described in this book as the angel of healing,[5] the office generally assigned to him by the Fathers. He is also represented as saying of himself that he is one of the seven holy angels which present the prayers of the saints to God.[6]

There are many curious particulars regarding angels and demons in the Book of Enoch. This work, which is quoted by the author of the Epistle of Jude,[7] and by some of the Fathers, as inspired Scripture, was supposed by Tertullian to have survived the universal deluge, or to have been afterwards transmitted by means of Noah, the great-grandson of the author Enoch.[8] It may be assigned to about a century before Christ, but additions were made to the text, and more especially to its angelology, extending probably to after the commencement of our era. It undoubtedly represents views popularly prevailing about the epoch in which we are interested. The author not only relates the fall of the angels through love for the daughters of men, but gives the names of twenty-one of them and of their leaders; of whom Jequn was he who seduced the holy angels, and Ashbeêl it was who gave them evil counsel and corrupted them.[9] A third, Gadreêl,[10] was he who seduced Eve. He also taught to the children of men the use and manufacture of all murderous weapons, of coats of mail, shields, swords, and of all the implements of death. Another evil angel, named Pênêmuê, taught them many mysteries of

[1] There is much discussion as to the date of this book. It is variously ascribed to periods ranging from two centuries B.C., and even earlier, to one century after Christ.

[2] Tobit, vi. 7. [3] *Ib.*, iii. 7 f.; vi. 14. [4] *Ib.*, viii. 2 f.

[5] *Ib.*, iii. 17.

[6] *Ib.*, xii. 15. Origen also states that the archangel Michael presents the prayers of the saints to God (*Hom.* xiv. *in Num.*, *Opp.* ii., p. 323).

[7] v. 14 f.

[8] Tertullian, *De Cultu fem.*, i. 3. [9] Cap. lxix. i. ff., cf. vi.

[10] In the extract preserved by George Syncellus in his *Chronography* (p. 11) the angel who taught the use of weapons of war, etc., is called Azæl or Azalzel.

wisdom. He instructed men in the art of writing with paper (χάρτης) and ink, by means of which, the author remarks, many fall into sin even to the present day. Kaodejâ, another evil angel, taught the human race all the wicked practices of spirits and demons,[1] and also magic and exorcism.[2] The offspring of the fallen angels and of the daughters of men were giants, whose height was 3,000 ells ;[3] of these are the demons working evil upon earth.[4] Azazel taught men various arts : the making of bracelets and ornaments ; the use of cosmetics, the way to beautify the eyebrows ; precious stones, and all dye-stuffs and metals ; whilst other wicked angels instructed them in all kinds of pernicious knowledge.[5] The elements and all the phenomena of nature are controlled and produced by the agency of angels. Uriel is the angel of thunder and earthquakes ; Raphael, of the spirits of men ; Raguel is the angel who executes vengeance on the world and the stars; Michael is set over the best of mankind — *i.e.*, over the people of Israel ;[6] Saraqâel, over the souls of the children of men who are misled by the spirits of sin ; and Gabriel is over serpents and over Paradise, and over the Cherubim.[7] Enoch is shown the mystery of all the operations of nature and the action of the elements, and he describes the spirits which guide them and control the thunder and lightning and the winds ; the spirit of the seas, who curbs them with his might, or tosses them forth and scatters them through the mountains of the earth ; the spirit of hoar frost, and the spirit of hail, and the spirit of snow. There are, in fact, special spirits set over every phenomenon of nature—frost, thaw, mist, rain, light, and so on.[8] The heavens and the earth are filled with spirits. Raphael is the angel set over all the diseases and wounds of mankind, Gabriel over all powers, and Fanuel over the penitence and the hope of those who inherit eternal life.[9] The decree for the destruction of the human race goes forth from the presence of the Lord because men know all the mysteries of the angels, all the evil works of Satan, and all the secret might and power of those who practise the art of magic, and the power of conjuring and such arts.[10] The stars are represented as animated beings. Enoch sees seven stars bound together in space like great mountains, and flaming as with fire ; and he inquires of the angel who leads him, on account of what sin they are so bound? Uriel informs him that they are stars which have transgressed the commands of the

[1] Enoch, c. lxix.
[2] C. vii.
[3] C. vii. 2 : one MS. has 300.
[4] C. xv.
[5] C. viii.
[6] Cf. Daniel x. 13, 21 ; xii. 1.
[7] C. xx.
[8] Enoch, c. lx. 12 ff., cf. xli. xxxiv.
[9] C. xl. 9 f., cf. xxxix.
[10] C. lxv. 6 ff.

Highest God, and they are thus bound until ten thousand worlds, the number of the days of their transgression, shall be accomplished.[1] The belief that sun, moon, and stars were living entities possessed of souls was generally held by the Jews at the beginning of our era, along with Greek philosophers, and we shall presently see it expressed by the Fathers. Philo Judæus considers the stars spiritual beings full of virtue and perfection,[2] and that to them is granted lordship over other heavenly bodies, not absolute, but as viceroys under the Supreme Being.[3] We find a similar view regarding the nature of the stars expressed in the Apocalypse,[4] and it constantly appears in the Talmud and Targums. An angel of the sun and moon is described in the *Ascensio Isaiæ*.[5]

We are able to obtain a full and minute conception of the belief regarding angels and demons and their influence over cosmical phenomena, as well as of other superstitions current amongst the Jews at the time of Jesus, from the Talmud, Targums, and other Rabbinical sources. We cannot, however, do more, here, than merely glance at these voluminous materials. The angels are perfectly pure spirits, without sin, and not visible to mortal eyes. When they come down to earth on any mission, they are clad in light and veiled in air. If, however, they remain longer than seven days on earth, they become so clogged with the earthly matter in which they have been immersed that they cannot again ascend to the upper heavens.[6] Their multitude is innumerable,[7] and new angels are every day created, who in succession praise God and make way for others.[8] The expression, "host of heaven," is a common one in the Old Testament, and the idea was developed into a heavenly army. The first Gospel represents Jesus as speaking of "more than twelve legions of angels."[9] Every angel has one particular duty to perform, and no more; thus of the three angels who appeared to Abraham, one was sent to announce that Sarah should have a son, the second to rescue Lot, and the third to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah.[10] The

[1] C. xxi., cf. xviii. 13 f.

[2] *De Mundo opificio*, § 48; *De Gigantibus*, § 2, cf. *De Somniis*, i., § 4 f., § 22.

[3] *De Monarchia*, i., § 1.

[4] Rev. i. 20, iii. 1, iv. 5, ix. 1, etc.

[5] C. iv. 18. This work referred to by Origen (*Ep. ad Africanum*), Epiphanius (*Hær.* xl. 2, lxvii. 3), Jerome (in *Esaiæ*, lxiv. 4), and others (cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Vet. Test.*, i., p. 1086 ff.), as Ἀναβατικὸν Ἡσαΐου, is dated variously from the middle of the first to the beginning of the third century. The work, long lost, was discovered and published by Lawrence, in 1819.

[6] *Sohar, Genesis*, p. 124. p. 266; *Pirke Elieser*, xlvi.; Eisenmenger, *Entd. Jud.*, ii., p. 387 f.; Gfrörer, *Das Jahrh. d. Heils*, i., p. 366.

[7] *Hieros. Targ. Exod.*, xii. 12, xxxiii. 23; Deut. xxxiv. 5, etc., etc.

[8] *Chagigah Bab.*, p. 14, 1, 2; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, ii., p. 371 ff.

[9] Matt. xxvi. 53.

[10] *Hieros. Targ. Genes.*, xvii. 2; Gfrörer, *ib.*, i., p. 363 f.

angels serve God in the administration of the universe, and to special angels are assigned the different parts of nature. "There is not a thing in the world, not even a little herb, over which there is not an angel set, and everything happens according to the command of these appointed angels."[1] It will be remembered that the agency of angels is frequently introduced in the Old Testament, and still more so in the Septuagint version, by alterations of the text. One notable case of such agency may be referred to, where the pestilence which is sent to punish David for numbering the people is said to be caused by an angel, whom David even sees. The Lord is represented as repenting of the evil, when the angel was stretching forth his hand against Jerusalem, and bidding him stay his hand after the angel had destroyed seventy thousand men by the pestilence.[2] This theory of disease has prevailed until comparatively recent times. The names of many of the superintending angels are given—as, for instance: Jehuel is set over fire, Michael over water, Jechiel over wild beasts, and Anpiel over birds. Over cattle Hariel is appointed, and Samniel over created things moving in the waters, and over the face of the earth; Messannahel over reptiles, Deliel over fish. Ruchiel is set over the winds, Gabriel over thunder and also over fire, and over the ripening of fruit; Nuriel over hail, Makturiel over rocks, Alpiel over fruit-bearing trees, Saroel over those which do not bear fruit, and Sandalfon over the human race; and under each of these there are subordinate angels.[3] It was believed that there were two angels of Death, one for those who died out of the land of Israel, who was an evil angel, called Samaël (and at other times Satan, Asmodeus, etc.), and the other, who presided over the dead of the land of Israel, the holy angel Gabriel; and under these there was a host of evil spirits and angels.[4] We shall presently see how general this belief regarding angels was amongst the Fathers, but it is also expressed in the New Testament. In the Apocalypse there appears an angel who has power over fire,[5] and in another place four angels have power to hurt the earth and the sea.[6] The angels were likewise

[1] *Jalkut Chadasch*, p. 147, 3; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, ii., p. 376 ff.; Gfrörer, *ib.*, i., p. 369.

[2] 2 Sam. xxiv. 15 f.

[3] *Berith Minucha*, p. 37, 1; cf. *Tract Pesachim*, p. 118, 1, 2; *Sanhedrin*, 95, 2; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, ii., p. 378 ff; Gfrörer, *ib.*, i., p. 369. The Targum upon 1 Kings xix. 11, 12, reads: "A host of the angels of the wind, a host of the angels of commotion, a host of the angels of fire; and after the host of the angels of fire, the voice of the silent singers." Lightfoot, *Horæ Heb. et Talm.*, Works, xii., p. 35.

[4] *Bava Mezia*, 36, 1; *Succah*, 53, 1; *Bava Bathra*, 16, 1; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, i., p. 821 f., p. 854 ff.; Lightfoot, *ib.*, xii., p. 428, p. 507 f.; Schoettgen, *Horæ Heb et Talm.*, p. 935.

[5] C. xiv. 18. [6] C. vii. 2, cf. ix. 11; xix. 17.

the instructors of men, and communicated knowledge to the Patriarchs. The angel Gabriel taught Joseph the seventy languages of the earth.[1] It appears, however, that there was one language—the Syriac—which the angels do not understand, and for this reason men were not permitted to pray for things needful in that tongue.[2] Angels are appointed as princes over the seventy nations of the world; but the Jews consider the angels set over Gentile nations merely demons.[3] The Septuagint translation of Deuteronomy xxxii. 8 introduces the statement into the Old Testament. Instead of the Most High, when he divided to the nations their inheritance, setting the bounds of the people "according to the number of the children of Israel," the passage becomes, "according to the number of the angels of God" (κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ). The number of the nations was fixed at seventy, the number of the souls who went down into Egypt.[4] The Jerusalem Targum on Genesis xi. 7, 8, reads as follows: "God spake to the seventy angels which stand before him: Come, let us go down and confound their language that they may not understand each other. And the word of the Lord appeared there (at Babel), with the seventy angels, according to the seventy nations, and each had the language of the people which was allotted to him, and the record of the writing in his hand, and scattered the nations from thence over the whole earth in seventy languages, so that the one did not understand what the other said."[5] Michael was the angel of the people of Israel,[6] and he is always set in the highest place amongst the angels, and often called the High Priest of Heaven.[7] It was believed that the angels of the nations fought in heaven when their allotted peoples made war on earth. We see an allusion to this in the Book of Daniel,[8] and in the Apocalypse there is "war in heaven; Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels."[9] The Jews of the time of Jesus not only held that there were angels set over the nations, but also that each

[1] *Tract, Sotah*, 33, 1; Gfrörer, *ib.*, i., p 366 ff; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, ii., p. 365, p. 374 f.

[2] *Beracoth*, c. 2; *Bab. Schabbath*, 12, 2; *Sotah*, 33, 1; Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 22; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, i., p. 675 f.; ii., p. 392 f.

[3] Eisenmenger, *ib.*, i., p. 805 ff., p. 816 f.

[4] Gen. xlvi. 27, Exod. i. 5, Deut. x. 22. Seventy disciples were, therefore, chosen to preach the Gospel, Luke x. 1 f. Of course, we need not here speak of the import of this number.

[5] Cf. *Pirke Elieser*, xxiv.; Gfrörer, *ib.*, i., p. 370 f.; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, i., p. 810.

[6] Cf. Daniel x. 21.

[7] *Bab. Menacoth*, 110, 1; *Beracoth*, 4, 2; *Sohar, Genes.*, fol. 17, col. 66; *Thosaphtah Chollin*, ii. 6; *Jalkut Rubeni*, 80, 1, 92, 4; *Serachim*, 62, 1; Gfrörer, *ib.*, i., p. 371 f.; Schoettgen, *ib.*, p. 1219 ff.

[8] X. 10 ff., and more especially verse 13. [9] C. xii. 7.

individual had a guardian angel.[1] This belief appears in several places in the New Testament. For instance, Jesus is represented as saying of the children: "For I say unto you that their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven."[2] Again, in the Acts of the Apostles, when Peter is delivered from prison by an angel and comes to the house of his friend, they will not believe the maid who had opened the gate and seen him, but say: "It is his angel" (ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν).[3] The passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews will likewise be remembered where it is said of the angels: "Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth for ministry on account of them who shall be heirs of salvation."[4] There was at the same time a singular belief that when any person went into the private closet the guardian angel remained at the door till he came out again, and in the Talmud a prayer is given for strength and help under the circumstances, and that the guardian angel may wait while the person is there. The reason why the angel does not enter is that such places are haunted by demons.[5]

The belief in demons at the time of Jesus was equally emphatic and comprehensive, and we need scarcely mention that the New Testament is full of references to them.[6] They are in the air, on earth, in the bodies of men and animals, and even at the bottom of the sea.[7] They are the offspring of the fallen angels who loved the daughters of men.[8] They have wings like the angels, and can fly from one end of heaven to another; they obtain a knowledge of the future, like the angels, by listening behind the veil of the Temple of God in heaven.[9] Their number is infinite. The earth is so full of them that if man had power to see he could not exist on account of them; there are more demons than men, and they are about as close as the earth thrown up out of a newly-made grave.[10] It is stated that each man has 10,000 demons at his right hand and 1,000 on his left, and the passage continues: "The crush on the Sabbath in the synagogue arises from them, also the

[1] *Hieros. Targ. Genes.*, xxxiii. 10, xlviii. 16. [2] Matt. xviii. 10.
[3] Acts xii. 15. [4] Heb. i. 14.
[5] *Hieros Beracoth*, ix. 5; *Bab. Beracoth*, 60, 1; *Gittin*, 70, 1: Eisenmenger, *ib.*, ii., p. 449 f.; Gfrörer, *ib.*, i., p. 374 f.; Moïse Schwab, *Traité des Berakhoth*, 1871, p. 169.
[6] Passing over the synoptic Gospels, in which references to demons abound, cf. 1 Cor. x. 20, 21; James ii. 19; 1 Tim. iv. 1; Eph. ii. 2, cf. iv. 12; Rev. ix. 20, xvi. 14, xviii. 2.
[7] Eisenmenger, *ib.*, ii., p. 437 f.
[8] *Ib.*, i., p. 380 f.
[9] *Bab. Chagigah*, 16, 1; Schoettgen, *ib.*, p. 1049: Eisenmenger, *ib.*, ii., p. 415.
[10] *Beracoth*, 6, 1; *Sohar, Genes.*, p. 171; *ib.*, *Numbers*, p. 291: Eisenmenger, *ib.*, ii., p. 446, p. 461 f.; Moïse Schwab, *Traité des Berakhoth*, 1871, p. 239.

dresses of the Rabbins become so soon old and torn through their rubbing; in like manner they cause the tottering of the feet. He who wishes to discover these spirits must take sifted ashes and strew them about his bed, and in the morning he will perceive their footprints upon them like a cock's tread. If anyone wish to see them, he must take the afterbirth of a black cat which has been littered by a first-born black cat, whose mother was also a first-birth, burn and reduce it to powder, and put some of it in his eyes, and he will see them."[1] Sometimes demons assume the form of a goat. Evil spirits fly chiefly during the darkness, for they are children of night.[2] For this reason the Talmud states that men are forbidden to greet anyone by night, lest it might be a devil,[3] or to go out alone even by day, but much more by night, into solitary places.[4] It was likewise forbidden for any man to sleep alone in a house, because anyone so doing would be seized by the she-devil Lilith and die.[5] Further, no man should drink water by night on account of the demon Schafriri, the angel of blindness.[6] An evil spirit descended on anyone going into a cemetery by night.[7] A necromancer is defined as one who fasts and lodges at night amongst tombs, in order that the evil spirit may come upon him.[8] Demons, however, take more especial delight in foul and offensive places, and an evil spirit inhabits every private closet in the world.[9] Demons haunt deserted places, ruins, graves, and certain kinds of trees.[10] We find indications of these superstitions throughout the Gospels. The possessed are represented as dwelling among the tombs and being driven by the unclean spirits into the wilderness, and the demons can find no rest in clean places.[11] Demons also frequented springs and fountains.[12] The

[1] *Bab. Beracoth*, 6, 1. In the *Tract. Gittin* (68, 2) of the Talmud, Asmodeus is represented as coming to Solomon's wives by night with slippers on to conceal his cock's feet. Eisenmenger, *ib.*, i., p. 356, p. 424 f.; ii., p. 445; Gfrörer, *ib.*, i., pp. 407, 409; Moïse Schwab, *Traité des Berakhoth*, 1871, p. 239 f.

[2] *Sohar, Exod.*, f. 67, col 267; Schoettgen, *ib.*, p. 316; cf. Ephes. vi. 12.

[3] *Sanhedrin*, 44, 1; *Megillah*, 3, 1; Gfrörer, *ib.*, i., p. 408; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, ii., p. 452.

[4] *Sohar, Genes.*, 387; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, ii., p. 451 f.

[5] *Schabbath*, 151, 2.

[6] *Pesachim*, 112, 1; *Avoda Sarah*, 12, 2; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, i., p. 426 f.; ii., p. 452.

[7] *Chagigah*, 3, 2; *Trumoth*, 40, 2; *Bava Bathra*, 100, 2; *Bab. Sanhedrin*, 65, 2; Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., pp. 160, 170, xii., pp. 134, 349; Gfrörer, *ib.*, i., p. 408.

[8] *Bab. Sanhedrin*, 65, 2; Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 170; xii., p. 134 f.

[9] *Bab. Schabbath*, 67, 1; *Bab. Beracoth*, 62, 1; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, ii., p. 449 f. Schwab, *Traité des Berakhoth*, p. 495 f.

[10] *Bab. Beracoth*, 3, 1; *Pesachim*, iii. 2; *Targ. Hieros.* Deut. xxx. 10; Schwab, *ib.*, p. 227.

[11] Matt. viii. 28, xii. 43; Mark v. 3, 5; Luke viii. 27, 29, xi. 24 f.

[12] *Vajicra Rabba*, § 24; Lightfoot, *ib.*, xii., p. 282.

episode of the angel who was said to descend at certain seasons and trouble the water of the pool of Bethesda, so that he who first stepped in was cured of whatever disease he had, may be mentioned here in passing, although the passage is not found in some of the older MSS. of the fourth Gospel,[1] and it is argued by some that it is a later interpolation. There were demons who hurt those who did not wash their hands before meat. "Shibta is an evil spirit which sits upon men's hands in the night, and if any touch his food with unwashen hands that spirit sits upon that food, and there is danger from it."[2] The demon Asmodeus is frequently called the king of the devils,[3] and it was believed that he tempted people to apostatise; he it was who enticed Noah into his drunkenness, and led Solomon into sin.[4] He is represented as alternately ascending to study in the school of the heavenly Jerusalem, and descending to study in the school of the earth.[5] The injury of the human race in every possible way was believed to be the chief delight of evil spirits. The Talmud and other Rabbinical writings are full of references to demoniacal possession; but we need not enter into details upon this point, as the New Testament itself presents sufficient evidence regarding it. Not only one evil spirit could enter into a body, but many took possession of the same individual. There are many instances mentioned in the Gospels, such as Mary Magdalene, "out of whom went seven demons" (δαιμόνια ἑπτὰ),[6] and the man whose name was Legion, because "many demons" (δαιμόνια πολλὰ) were entered into him.[7] Demons likewise entered into the bodies of animals, and in the narrative to which we have just referred the demons, on being expelled from the man, request that they may be allowed to enter into the herd of swine, which, being permitted, "the demons went out of the man into the swine, and the herd ran violently down the cliff into the lake, and were drowned,"[8]

[1] John v. 3, 4. The authenticity is fully discussed in *S. R.*, complete ed., vol. ii., p. 420 f.

[2] *Bab. Taanith*, 20, 2; *Sohar, Bereschith;* Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 215.

[3] *Gittin*, 68, 1. [4] Lightfoot, *ib.*, xii., p. 111.

[5] *Gittin*, 68, 1; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, i., p. 351. Schoettgen, *ib.*, p. 1233, § iv. Schoettgen gives minute details from the Talmud, etc., regarding the *Academia Celestis*, its constitution, and the questions discussed in it, pp. 1230–1236. The representation of Satan in the book of Job will not be forgotten.

[6] Luke viii. 2; cf. Mark xvi. 9.

[7] Luke viii. 30 ff. The name Legion does not only express a great number, but to the word was attached the idea of an unclean company, for a Legion passing from place to place and entering a house rendered it "unclean." The reason was: "For there is no legion which hath not some carcaphelion" (καρακεφαλή); that is to say, the skin of the head pulled off from a dead person and used for enchantments. (Cf. *Chollin*, 1231; Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 394.)

[8] Luke viii. 33.

the evil spirits, as usual, taking pleasure only in the destruction and injury of man and beast. Besides "possession," all the diseases of men and animals were ascribed to the action of the devil and of demons.[1] In the Gospels, for instance, the woman with a spirit of infirmity, who was bowed together and could not lift herself up, is described as "bound by Satan," although the case was not one of demoniacal possession.[2]

As might be expected from the universality of the belief in demons and their influence over the human race, the Jews at the time of Jesus occupied themselves much with the means of conjuring them. "There was hardly any people in the whole world," we have already heard from a great Hebrew scholar, "that more used, or were more fond of, amulets, charms, mutterings, exorcisms, and all kinds of enchantments."[3] Schoettgen bears similar testimony: "*Cæterum judæos magicis artibus admodum deditos esse, notissimum est.*"[4] All competent scholars are agreed upon this point, and the Talmud and Rabbinical writings are full of it. The exceeding prevalence of such arts alone proves the existence of the grossest ignorance and superstition. There are elaborate rules in the Talmud with regard to dreams, both as to how they are to be obtained and how interpreted.[5] Fasts were enjoined in order to secure good dreams, and these fasts were not only observed by the ignorant, but also by the principal Rabbins, and they were permitted even on the Sabbath, which was unlawful in other cases.[6] Indeed, the interpretation of dreams became a public profession.[7] It would be impossible within our limits to convey an adequate idea of the general superstition prevalent amongst Jews regarding things and actions lucky and unlucky, or the minute particulars in regard to every common act prescribed for safety against demons and evil influences of all kinds. Nothing was considered indifferent or too trifling, and the danger from the most trivial movements or omissions to which men were supposed to be exposed from the malignity of evil spirits was believed to be

[1] *Bab. Joma*, 83, 2; *Bab. Gittin*, 67, 2; *Hieros. Schabbath*, 14, 3; *Mischna, Gittin*, vii. 1; *Gemara*, 67, 2; *Sohar, Genes.*, 42; Gfrörer, *ib.*, i., p. 411 f. Eisenmenger, *ib.*, ii., p. 454; Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 237 f., xii., p. 134 f. Shibta, whom we have already met with, was said to take hold of the necks of infants, and to dry up and contract their nerves. Aruch, in *Shibta*: Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 237.

[2] Luke xiii. 11 ff.; cf. Mark ix. 25; Matt. xii. 22, ix. 32; Luke xi. 14.

[3] Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 208.

[4] *Horæ Hebr. et Talm.*, p. 474; cf. Edzard, *Avoda Sarah*, ii., pp. 311–356; Gfrörer, *ib.*, i., p. 143.

[5] *Bab. Beracoth*, 56 ff.; Schwab, *Traité des Berakhoth*, p. 457 ff.

[6] *Bab. Schabbath*, 11, 1; *Beracoth*, 14, 1; Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 299 f., p. 163.

[7] *Bab. Beracoth*, 55, 2, 56, 1; *Maasar Sheni*, 52, 2, 3; Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 300; Schwab, *Traité des Berakhoth*, p. 457 ff.

great.[1] Amulets, consisting of roots, or pieces of paper with charms written upon them, were hung round the neck of the sick and considered efficacious for their cure. Charms, mutterings, and spells were commonly said over wounds, against unlucky meetings, to make people sleep, to heal diseases, and to avert enchantments.[2] The Talmud gives forms of enchantments against mad dogs, for instance, against the demon of blindness, and the like, as well as formulæ for averting the evil eye, and mutterings over diseases.[3] So common was the practice of sorcery and magic that the Talmud enjoins "that the senior who is chosen into the council ought to be skilled in the arts of astrologers, jugglers, diviners, sorcerers, etc., that he may be able to judge of those who are guilty of the same."[4] Numerous cases are recorded of persons destroyed by means of sorcery.[5] The Jewish women were particularly addicted to sorcery and, indeed, the Talmud declares that they had generally fallen into it.[6] The New Testament bears abundant testimony to the prevalence of magic and exorcism at the time at which its books were written. In the Gospels, Jesus is represented as arguing with the pharisees, who accuse him of casting out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils: "If I by Beelzebub cast out the demons (τὰ δαιμόνια), by whom do your sons cast them out? Therefore, let them be your judges."[7]

The thoroughness and universality of the Jewish popular belief in demons and evil spirits and in the power of magic is exhibited in the ascription to Solomon, the monarch in whom the greatness and glory of the nation attained its culminating point, of the character of the powerful magician. The most effectual forms of invocation and exorcism and the most potent spells of magic were said to have been composed by him, and thus the grossest superstition of the nation acquired the sanction of their wisest king. Rabbinical writings are never weary of enlarging upon the magical power and knowledge of Solomon. He was represented as not only king of the whole earth, but also as reigning over devils and evil spirits, and having the power of expelling them from the bodies of men and animals, and also of delivering people to them.[8]

[1] See, for instance, *Bab. Berakhoth*, 51, 1; Schwab, *Traité des Berakhoth*, p. 433 f.

[2] Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 301 f.

[3] See references, Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 301; *Bab. Beracoth*, 57, 2, etc.; Schwab, *ib.*, p. 302, p. 456 f., etc., etc.

[4] Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 301.

[5] *Hieros. Schab.*, 14, 3; *Sanhedr.*, 18, 3; Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 301 f.

[6] *Hieros. Sanhedr.*, 23, 3; *Bab. Sanhedr.*, 44, 2; *Bab. Beracoth*, 53, 1; Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 302; Gfrörer, *ib.*, i., p. 413; Schwab, *ib.*, p. 444.

[7] Matt. xii. 27; cf. Luke xi. 19, ix. 49; Mark ix. 38; Acts xix. 13 ff.

[8] *Gittin*, 68, 1, 2; *Succah*, 53, 1; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, i., pp. 355, 358; ii., pp. 416, 440; Lightfoot, *ib.*, xii., p. 428.

It was, indeed, believed that the two demons Asa and Asael taught Solomon all wisdom and all arts.[1] The Talmud relates many instances of his power over evil spirits, and, amongst others, how he made them assist in building the Temple. Solomon desired to have the help of the worm Schamir in preparing the stones for the sacred building, and he conjured up a devil and a she-devil to inform him where Schamir was to be found. They referred him to Asmodeus, whom the King craftily captured, and by whom he was informed that Schamir is under the jurisdiction of the Prince of the Seas; and Asmodeus further told him how he might be secured. By his means the Temple was built, but, from the moment it was destroyed, Schamir for ever disappeared.[2] It was likewise believed that one of the Chambers of the second Temple was built by the magician called Parvah, by means of magic.[3] The Talmud narrates many stories of miracles performed by various Rabbins.[4]

The Jewish historian Josephus informs us that, among other gifts, God bestowed upon King Solomon knowledge of the way to expel demons, an art which is useful and salutary for mankind. He composed incantations by which diseases are cured, and he left behind him forms of exorcism by which demons may be so effectually expelled that they never return—a method of cure, Josephus adds, which is of great efficacy to his own day. He himself had seen a countryman of his own, named Eliezer, release people possessed of devils in the presence of the Emperor Vespasian and his sons, and of his army. He put a ring containing one of the roots prescribed by Solomon to the nose of the demoniac, and drew the demon out by his nostrils; and, in the name of Solomon, and reciting one of his incantations, he adjured it to return no more. In order to demonstrate to the spectators that he had the power to cast out devils, Eliezer was accustomed to set a vessel full of water a little way off, and he commanded the demon as he left the body of the man to overturn it, by which means, says Josephus, the skill and wisdom of Solomon were made very manifest.[5] Jewish Rabbins generally were known as powerful exorcisers, practising the art according to the formulæ of their great monarch. Justin Martyr reproaches his Jewish oppo-

[1] Eisenmenger, *ib.*, i., p. 361 f.

[2] *Gittin*, 68, 1, 2; *Sotah*, 48, 2; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, i., p. 350 ff.; Gfrörer, *ib.*, i., p. 414 f.; Buxtorf, *Lexic. Talmud.*, p. 2455. Moses is also said to have made use of Schamir. Fabricius, *Cod. Vet. Test.*, ii., p. 119.

[3] Gloss on *Middoth*, cap. 5, hal. 3; Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 301.

[4] *Bava Mezia*, 59, 1, 2; *Bab. Beracoth*, 33, 34, 54, 1; *Hieros. Sanhedr.*, 25, 4; *Bab. Taanith*, 24; *Juchas*, 20, 1; 56, 2; Lightfoot, *ib.*, xi., p. 301 f.; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, i., 14 f.; Schwab, *ib.*, p. 358 ff., p. 448 f.

[5] *Antiq.*, viii., 2, § 5.

nent, Tryphon, with the fact that his countrymen use the same art as the Gentiles, and exorcise with fumigations and charms (κατάδεσμοι), and he shows the common belief in demoniacal influence when he asserts that, while Jewish exorcists cannot overcome demons by such means, or even by exorcising them in the name of their kings, prophets, or patriarchs, though he admits that they might do so if they adjured them in the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, yet Christians at once subdued demons by exorcising them in the name of the Son of God.[1] The Jew and the Christian were quite agreed that demons were to be exorcised, and merely differed as to the formula of exorcism. Josephus gives an account of a root potent against evil spirits. It is called Baaras, and is flame-coloured, and in the evening sends out flashes like lightning. It is certain death to touch it, except under peculiar conditions. One mode of securing it is to dig down till the smaller part of the root is exposed, and then to attach the root to a dog's tail. When the dog tries to follow its master from the place, and pulls violently, the root is plucked up, and may then be safely handled ; but the dog instantly dies, as the man would have done had he plucked it up himself. When the root is brought to sick people, it at once expels demons.[2] According to Josephus, demons are the spirits of the wicked dead ; they enter into the bodies of the living, who die unless succour be speedily obtained.[3] This theory, however, was not general, demons being commonly considered the offspring of the fallen angels and of the daughters of men.

The Jewish historian gives a serious account of the preternatural portents which warned the Jews of the approaching fall of Jerusalem, and he laments the infatuation of the people, who disregarded these Divine denunciations. A star in the shape of a sword, and also a comet, stood over the doomed city for the space of a whole year. Then, at the feast of unleavened bread, before the rebellion of the Jews which preceded the war, at the ninth hour of the night, a great light shone round the altar and the Temple, so that for half an hour it seemed as though it were brilliant daylight. At the same festival other supernatural warnings were given. A heifer, as she was led by the high priest to be sacrificed, brought forth a lamb in the Temple ; moreover, the eastern gate of the inner court of the Temple, which was of brass, and so ponderous that twenty men had much difficulty in closing it, and which was fastened by heavy bolts descending deep into the solid stone floor, was seen to open of its own accord, about the sixth hour of the night. The ignorant considered some of

[1] *Dial. c. Tryph.*, 85 ; cf. *Apol.*, ii., 6 ; Acts xix., 13 ff.
[2] *De Bello Jud.*, viii., 6, § 3. [3] *Ib.*, vii., 6, § 3.

these events good omens, but the priests interpreted them as portents of evil. Another prodigious phenomenon occurred, which Josephus supposes would be considered incredible were it not reported by those who saw it, and were the subsequent events not of sufficient importance to merit such portents: before sunset, chariots and troops of soldiers in armour were seen among the clouds, moving about, and surrounding cities. And further, at the feast of Pentecost, as the priests were entering the inner court of the Temple to perform their sacred duties, they felt an earthquake, and heard a great noise, and then the sound as of a great multitude saying, "Let us remove hence."[1] There is not a shadow of doubt in the mind of Josephus as to the reality of any of these wonders.

If we turn to patristic literature, we find everywhere the same superstitions and the same theories of angelic agency and demoniacal interference in cosmical phenomena. According to Justin Martyr, after God had made the world and duly regulated the elements and the rotation of the seasons, he committed man and all things under heaven to the care of angels. Some of these angels, however, proved unworthy of this charge and, led away by love of the daughters of men, begat children, who are the demons who have corrupted the human race, partly by magical writings (*διὰ μαγικῶν γραφῶν*) and partly by fears and punishments, and who have introduced wars, murders, and other evils among them, which are ignorantly ascribed by poets to God himself.[2] He considers that demoniacs are possessed and tortured by the souls of the wicked dead,[3] and he represents evil spirits as watching to seize the soul at death.[4] The food of the angels is manna.[5] The angels, says Clement of Alexandria, serve God in the administration of earthly affairs.[6] The host of angels and of gods (*θεῶν*) is placed under subjection to the Logos.[7] Presiding angels are distributed over nations and cities, and perhaps are also deputed to individuals,[8] and it is by their agency, either visible or invisible, that God gives all good things.[9] He accuses the Greeks of plagiarising their miracles from the Bible, and he argues that, if certain powers do move the winds and distribute showers, they are agents subject to God.[10] Clement affirms that the Son gave philosophy to the Greeks by means of the inferior angels,[11] and argues that it is absurd to attribute it to the devil.[12] Theophilus

[1] *De Bello Jud.*, vi., 5, § 3.
[2] *Apol.*, ii., 5; cf. *Apol.*, i., 5, 14.
[3] *Apol.*, i., 18.
[4] *Dial. c. Tryph.*, 105.
[5] *Dial.*, 57, cf. 131.
[6] *Stromata*, vii., 1, § 3.
[7] *Strom.*, vii., 2, § 5.
[8] *Strom.*, vii., 2, § 6; vi., 17, § 157.
[9] *Strom.*, vi., 17, § 161.
[10] *Strom.*, vi., 3, § 30.
[11] *Strom.*, vii., 2, § 6.
[12] *Strom.*, vi., 17, § 159.

of Antioch, on the other hand, says that the Greek poets were inspired by demons.[1] Athenagoras states, as one of the principal points of belief among Christians, that a multitude of angels and ministers are distributed and appointed by the Logos to occupy themselves about the elements and the heavens and the universe and the things in it, and the regulating of the whole.[2] For it is the duty of the angels to exercise providence over all that God has created, so that God may have the universal care of the whole, but the several parts be ministered to by the angels appointed over them. There is freedom of will amongst the angels as among human beings, and some of the angels abused their trust, and fell through love of the daughters of men, of whom were begotten those who are called giants.[3] These angels who have fallen from heaven busy themselves about the air and the earth; and the souls of the giants,[4] which are the demons that roam about the world, work evil according to their respective natures.[5] There are powers which exercise dominion over matter, and by means of it, and more especially one who is opposed to God. This Prince of matter exerts authority and control in opposition to the good designed by God.[6] Demons are greedy for sacrificial odours and the blood of the victims, which they lick, and they influence the multitude to idolatry by inspiring thoughts and visions which seem to come from idols and statues.[7] According to Tatian, God made everything which is good, but the wickedness of demons perverts the productions of nature for bad purposes, and the evil in these is due to demons and not to God.[8] None of the demons have bodies—they are spiritual, like fire or air, and can only be seen by those in whom the Spirit of God dwells. They attack men by means of lower forms of matter, and come to them whenever they are diseased; and sometimes they cause disorders of the body, but when they are struck by the power of the word of God they flee in terror, and the sick person is healed.[9] Various kinds of roots and the relations of bone and sinew are the material elements through which demons work.[10] Some of those who are called gods by the Greeks, but are in reality demons,

[1] *Ad Autolycum*, ii. 8. Theophilus sees the punishment of the serpent in the repulsive way in which he crawls on his belly and eats the dust. This and the pains of women in childbirth are proofs of the truth of the account of the fall in Genesis. *Ad Autol.*, ii. 23.

[2] *Legatio pro Christ.*, x.; cf. xxiv.

[3] *Legatio pro Christ.*, xiv.

[4] It is said in the *Clementine Recognitions* that the giants were born in the ninth generation of the human race, and that their bones are still preserved in some places; i. 29. Cf. Clement, *Hom.* viii. 15.

[5] *Legatio pro Christ.*, xxv.

[6] *Ib.*, xxiv., xxv.

[7] *Ib.*, xxvi., xxvii.

[8] *Orat. ad Græcos*, 12.

[9] *Ib.*, 16.

[10] *Ib.*, 17.

possess the bodies of certain men, and then, by publicly leaving them, they destroy the disease they themselves had created, and the sick are restored to health.[1] Demons, says Cyprian of Carthage, lurk under consecrated statues, and inspire false oracles and control the lots and omens.[2] They enter into human bodies and feign various maladies in order to induce men to offer sacrifices for their recovery, that they may gorge themselves with the fumes, and then they heal them. They are really the authors of the miracles attributed to heathen deities.[3]

Tertullian enters into minute details regarding angels and demons. Demons are the offspring of the fallen angels, and their work is the destruction of the human race. They inflict diseases and other painful calamities upon our bodies, and lead astray our souls. From their wonderful subtleness and tenuity they find their way into both parts of our composition. Their spirituality enables them to do much harm to men, for, being invisible and impalpable, they appear rather in their effects than in their action. They blight the apples and the grain while in the flower as by some mysterious poison in the breeze, and kill them in the bud, or nip them before they are ripe, as though in some inexpressible way the tainted air poured forth its pestilential breath. In the same way demons and angels breathe into the soul and excite its corruptions, and especially mislead men by inducing them to sacrifice to false deities, in order that they may thus obtain their peculiar food of fumes of flesh and blood. Every spirit, whether angel or demon, has wings; therefore, they are everywhere in a moment. The whole world is but one place to them, and all that takes place anywhere they can know and report with equal facility. Their swiftness is believed to be divine because their substance is unknown, and thus they seek to be considered the authors of effects which they merely report, as, indeed, they sometimes are of the evil, but never of the good. They gather intimations of the future from hearing the prophets read aloud, and set themselves up as rivals of the true God by stealing his divinations. From inhabiting the air, and from their proximity to the stars and commerce with the clouds, they know the preparation of celestial phenomena, and promise beforehand the rains which they already feel coming. They are very kind in reference to the cure of diseases, Tertullian ironically says, for they first make people ill, and then, by way of performing a miracle, they prescribe remedies either novel or contrary to common experience, and, removing the cause, they

[1] *Ib.*, 18; cf. Tertullian, *Apol.*, § 22; Origen, *Contra Cels.*, viii. 31 f.
[2] Cf. Tertullian, *De Spectaculis*, §§ 12, 13; Clem., *Recog.*, iv. 19 ff.
[3] Cyprian, *De Idol. Vanitate*, § 7; cf. Minutius Felix, *Octavius*, § 27; Tertullian, *Apol.*, 22; Eusebius, *Prep. Evang.*, vii. 16.

are believed to have healed the sick.[1] If anyone possessed by a demon be brought before a tribunal, Tertullian affirms that the evil spirit, when ordered by a Christian, will at once confess that he is a demon.[2] The fallen angels were the discoverers of astrology and magic.[3] Unclean spirits hover over waters in imitation of the brooding (*gestatio*) of the Holy Spirit in the beginning, as, for instance, over dark fountains and solitary streams and cisterns in baths and dwelling-houses and similar places, which are said to carry one off (*rapere*) that is to say, by the force of the evil spirit.[4] The fallen angels disclosed to the world unknown material substances and various arts such as metallurgy, the properties of herbs, incantations, and interpretation of the stars; and to women specially they revealed all the secrets of personal adornment.[5] There is scarcely any man who is not attended by a demon: and it is well known that untimely and violent deaths which are attributed to accidents are really caused by demons.[6] Those who go to theatres may become specially accessible to demons. There is the instance, the Lord is witness (*domino teste*), of the woman who went to a theatre and came back possessed by a demon, and, on being cast out, the evil spirit replied that he had a right to act as he did, having found her within his limits. There was another case, also well known, of a woman who at night, after having been to a theatre, had a vision of a winding sheet (*linteum*), and heard the name of the tragedian whom she had seen mentioned with reprobation, and five days after the woman was dead.[7] Origen attributes augury and divination through animals to demons. In his opinion, certain demons, offspring of the Titans or giants, who haunt the grosser parts of bodies and the unclean places of the earth, and who, from not having earthly bodies, have some power of divining the future, occupy themselves with this. They secretly enter the bodies of the more brutal and savage animals, and force them to make flights or indications of divination to lead men away from God. They have a special leaning to birds and serpents, and even to foxes and wolves, because the demons act better through these in consequence of an apparent analogy in wickedness between them.[8] It is for this reason that Moses, who had either been taught by God what was similar in the nature of animals and their kindred demons, or had discovered it himself, prohibited as unclean the particular birds and animals most used for divination. Therefore, each kind of demon seems to have an affinity

[1] Tertullian, *Apol.*, § 22; cf. 23, *ad Scapulam*, § 2. [2] *Apol.*, § 23.
[3] *De Idolotria*, § 9; *De Cultu Fem.*, i., § 2. [4] *De Baptismo*, § 5.
[5] *De Cultu Fem.*, i., §§ 2, 10; Cf. Commodianus, *Instit.*, § 3; Lactantius, *Instit. Div.*, ii. 16; Clem. *Hom.*, viii. 14.
[6] *De Anima*, § 57. [7] *De Spectaculis*, § 26.
[8] *Contra Cels.*, iv. 92; cf. viii. 11.

with a certain kind of animal. They are so wicked that demons even assume the bodies of weasels to foretell the future.[1] They feed on the blood and odour of the victims sacrificed in idol temples.[2] The spirits of the wicked dead wander about sepulchres, and sometimes for ages haunt particular houses and other places.[3] The prayers of Christians drive demons out of men, and from places where they have taken up their abode, and even sometimes from the bodies of animals, which are frequently injured by them.[4] In reply to a statement of Celsus that we cannot eat bread or fruit, or drink wine or even water, without eating and drinking with demons, and that the very air we breathe is received from demons, and that, consequently, we cannot inhale without receiving air from the demons who are set over the air,[5] Origen maintains, on the contrary, that the angels of God, and not demons, have the superintendence of such natural phenomena, and have been appointed to communicate all these blessings. Not demons but angels have been set over the fruits of the earth and over the birth of animals and over all things necessary for our race.[6] Scripture forbids the eating of things strangled, because the blood is still in them—and blood, and more especially the fumes of it, is said to be the food of demons. If we ate strangled animals, we might have demons feeding with us;[7] but, in Origen's opinion, a man only eats and drinks with demons when he eats the flesh of idol sacrifices, and drinks the wine poured out in honour of demons.[8] Jerome states the common belief that the air is filled with demons.[9] Chrysostum says that angels are everywhere in the atmosphere.[10]

Not content, however, with peopling earth and air with angels and demons, the Fathers also shared the opinion, common to Jews[11] and heathen philosophers, that the heavenly bodies were animated beings. After fully discussing the question, with much reference to Scripture, Origen determines that sun, moon, and stars are living and rational beings, illuminated with the light of knowledge by the wisdom which is the reflection (ἀπαύγασμα) of eternal light. They have free will and, as it would appear from a passage in Job (xxv. 5), they are not only liable to sin, but actually not pure from the uncleanness of it. Origen is careful to explain that this has not reference merely to their physical part, but to the spiritual; and he proceeds to discuss whether their souls came into existence at the same time with their bodies, or existed

[1] *Ib.*, iv. 93; cf. iii. 29, 35, 36, v. 5; Barnabas, *Epist.*, x.; Clemens Al., *Pædag.*, ii. 10.
[2] *Contra Cels.*, vii. 35, cf. 5, viii. 61, cf. 60.
[3] *Ib.*, vii. 5.
[4] *Contra Cels.*, vii. 67.
[5] *Ib.*, viii. 28, 31.
[6] *Ib.*, viii. 57, 31 f.
[7] *Ib.*, viii. 30.
[8] *Ib.*, viii. 31, cf. 57.
[9] *Hieron., Epist. ad Ephes.*, iii. 6.
[10] *In Ascens. J. C.*
[11] Cf. Philo, *De Somniis*, i., § 22.

previously, and whether, at the end of the world, they will be released from their bodies or will cease from giving light to the world. He argues that they are rational beings because their motions could not take place without a soul. "As the stars move with so much order and method," he says, "that under no circumstances whatever does their course seem to be disturbed, is it not the extreme of absurdity to suppose that so much order, so much observance of discipline and method, could be demanded from or fulfilled by irrational beings?"[1] They possess life and reason, he decides, and he proves from Scripture that their souls were given to them, not at the creation of their bodily substance, but like those of men implanted strictly from without, after they were made.[2] They are "subject to vanity" with the rest of the creatures, and "wait for the manifestation of the sons of God."[3] Origen is persuaded that sun, moon, and stars pray to the Supreme Being through his only begotten Son.[4] To return to angels, however, Origen states that the angels are not only of various orders of rank, but have apportioned to them specific offices and duties. To Raphael, for instance, is assigned the task of curing and healing; to Gabriel the management of wars; to Michael the duty of receiving the prayers and the supplications of men. Angels are set over the different churches, and have charge even of the least of their members. These offices were assigned to the angels by God agreeably to the qualities displayed by each.[5] Elsewhere Origen explains that it is necessary for this world that there should be angels set over beasts and over terrestrial operations, and also angels presiding over the birth of animals, and over the propagation and growth of shrubs; and, again, angels over holy works, who eternally teach men the perception of the hidden ways of God and knowledge of divine things; and he warns us not to bring upon ourselves those angels who are set over beasts, by leading an animal life, nor those which preside over terrestrial works, by taking delight in fleshly and mundane things, but rather to study how we may approximate to the companionship of the Archangel Michael, to whose duty of presenting the prayers of the saints to God he here adds the office of presiding over medicine.[6]

[1] *De Principiis*, i. 7, § 3; cf. *Contra Cels.*, v. 10, 11. [2] *Ib.*, i. 7, § 4.

[3] *Ib.*, i. 7, § 5; cf. iii. 5, § 4. Origen applies to sun, moon, and stars the wish of Paul (Phil. i. 23). Tatian likewise ascribes spirituality to stars, plants, and waters; but, although one and the same with the soul in angels and animals, there are certain differences. *Orat. ad Græcos*, 12; cf. Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.*, vii. 15.

[4] *Contra Cels.*, v. 11.

[5] *De Principiis*, i. 8, § 1, cf. § 4; *Contra Cels.*, v. 4, 5. Cf. Hermas, *Pastor*, ii., Mand. vi., §§ 1, 2; Tertullian, *De Orat.*, § 12; *De Anima*, § 37; Clemens Al., *Strom.*, v. 14, § 92, vii. 13, § 81.

[6] Hom. xiv. in *Num.*, Opp. ii., p. 323.

It is through the ministry of angels that the water-springs in fountains and running streams refresh the earth, and that the air we breathe is kept pure.[1] In the *Shepherd* of Hermas, a work quoted by the Fathers as inspired Scripture, which was publicly read in the churches, which almost secured a permanent place in the New Testament canon, and which appears after the canonical books in the Codex Sinaiticus, the oldest extant MS. of the New Testament, mention is made of an angel who has rule over beasts, and whose name is Hegrin.[2] Jerome also quotes an apocryphal work in which an angel of similar name is said to be set over reptiles, and in which fishes, trees, and beasts are assigned to the care of particular angels.[3]

Clement of Alexandria mentions, without dissent, the prevailing belief that hail-storms, tempests, and similar phenomena do not occur merely from material disturbance, but also are caused by the anger of demons and evil angels.[4] Origen states that, while angels superintend all the phenomena of nature, and control what is appointed for our good, famine, the blighting of vines and fruit trees, and the destruction of beasts and of men, are, on the other hand, the personal works[5] of demons, they, as public executioners, receiving at certain times authority to carry into effect divine decrees.[6] We have already quoted similar views expressed by Tertullian,[7] and the universality and permanence of such opinions may be illustrated by the fact that, after the lapse of many centuries, we find St. Thomas Aquinas as solemnly affirming that disease and tempests are the direct work of the devil;[8] indeed, this belief prevailed throughout the middle ages until very recent times. The Apostle Peter, in the *Recognitions* of Clement, informs Clement that, when God made the world, he appointed chiefs over the various creatures, even over the trees and the mountains and springs and rivers, and over everything in the universe. An angel was set over the angels, a spirit over spirits, a star over the stars, a demon over the demons, and so on.[9] He provided different offices for all his creatures, whether good or bad;[10] but certain angels, having left the course of their proper order, led men into sin and taught them that demons could, by magical invocations, be made to obey man.[11] Ham was the discoverer of the art of magic.[12] Astrologers suppose that evils

[1] *Contra Cels.*, viii. 57, 31.
[2] i. *Visio*, iv. 2; in the Sinaitic Codex, the name is Θεγρι. Cotelerius, in the Greek version, has Ἄγριον.
[3] *Hieron.*, in *Habacuc*, i. 1, 14.
[4] *Stromata*, vi. 3, § 31.
[5] Cf. Matt. viii. 31 ff.
[6] *Contra Cels.*, viii. 31.
[7] *Apolog.*, § 22 f.
[8] *Summa Theolog.*, 1, quæst., 80, § 2.
[9] Clem., *Recog.*, i. 45.
[10] *Ib.*, iv. 25.
[11] *Ib.*, iv. 26.
[12] *Ib.*, iv. 27.

happen in consequence of the motions of the heavenly bodies; and represent certain climacteric periods as dangerous, not knowing that it is not the course of the stars, but the action of demons, that regulates these things.[1] God has committed the superintendence of the seventy-two nations into which he has divided the earth to as many angels.[2] Demons insinuate themselves into the bodies of men, and force them to fulfil their desires;[3] they sometimes appear visibly to men, and by threats or promises endeavour to lead them into error; they can transform themselves into whatever forms they please.[4] The distinction between what is spoken by the true God through the prophets or by visions, and that which is delivered by demons, is this: that what proceeds from the former is always true, whereas that which is foretold by demons is not always true.[5] Lactantius says that when the number of men began to increase, fearing that the Devil should corrupt or destroy them, God sent angels to protect and instruct the human race, but the angels themselves fell beneath his wiles, and from being angels they became the satellites and ministers of Satan. The offspring of these fallen angels are unclean spirits, authors of all the evils which are done, and the Devil is their chief. They are acquainted with the future, but not completely. The art of the magi is altogether supported by these demons, and at their invocation they deceive men with lying tricks, making men think they see things which do not exist. These contaminated spirits wander over all the earth, and console themselves by the destruction of men. They fill every place with frauds and deceits, for they adhere to individuals, and occupy whole houses, and assume the name of genii, as demons are called in the Latin language, and make men worship them. On account of their tenuity and impalpability, they insinuate themselves into the bodies of men, and through their *viscera* injure their health, excite diseases, terrify their souls with dreams, agitate their minds with phrenzies, so that they may by these evils drive men to seek their aid.[6] Being adjured in the name of God, however, they leave the bodies of the possessed, uttering the greatest howling, and crying out that they are beaten, or are on fire.[7] These demons are the inventors of astrology, divination, oracles, necromancy, and the art of magic.[8] The universe is governed by God through the medium of angels. The demons have a foreknowledge of the purposes of God, from having been his ministers and, interposing in what is being done,

[1] *Ib.*, ix. 12. [2] *Ib.*, ii. 42.
[3] Clem., *Recog.*, iv. 15 ff. [4] *Ib.*, iv. 19. [5] *Ib.*, iv. 21.
[6] *Instit. Div.*, ii. 14; cf. *Inst. Epit. ad Pentad.*, 27 f.
[7] *Ib.*, ii. 15; cf. iv. 27, v. 21; cf. Arnobius, *Adv. Gentes*, i. 46.
[8] *Ib.*, ii. 16.

they ascribe the credit to themselves.[1] The sign of the cross is a terror to demons, and at the sight of it they flee from the bodies of men. When sacrifices are being offered to the gods, if one be present who bears on his forehead the sign of the cross, the sacred rites are not propitious (*sacra nullo modo litant*), and the oracle gives no reply.[2]

Eusebius, like all the Fathers, represents the gods of the Greeks and other heathen nations as merely wicked demons. Demons, he says, whether they circulate in the dark and heavy atmosphere which encircles our sphere or inhabit the cavernous dwellings which exist within it, find charms only in tombs and in the sepulchres of the dead, and in impure and unclean places. They delight in the blood of animals, and in the putrid exhalations which rise from their bodies, as well as in earthly vapours. Their leaders, whether as inhabitants of the upper regions of the atmosphere or plunged in the abyss of hell, having discovered that the human race had deified and offered sacrifices to men who were dead, promoted the delusion in order to savour the blood which flowed and the fumes of the burning flesh. They deceived men by the motions conveyed to idols and statues, by the oracles they delivered, and by healing diseases, with which, by the power inherent in their nature, they had before invisibly smitten bodies, and which they removed by ceasing to torture them. These demons first introduced magic amongst men.[3] We may here refer to the account of a miracle which Eusebius seriously quotes, as exemplifying another occasional function of the angels. The heretical Bishop Natalius, having in vain been admonished by God in dreams, was at last lashed through the whole of a night by holy angels, till he was brought to repentance and, clad in sackcloth and covered with ashes, he at length threw himself at the feet of Zephyrinus, then Bishop of Rome, pointing to the marks of the scourges which he had received from the angels, and implored to be again received into communion with the Church.[4] Augustine says that demons inhabit the atmosphere, as in a prison, and deceive men, persuading them, by their wonderful and false signs or doings or predictions, that they are gods.[5] He considers the origin of their name in the Sacred Scriptures worthy of notice; they are called Δαίμονες in Greek, on account of their knowledge.[6] By their experience of certain signs, which are hidden from us, they can read much more of the future, and sometimes even announce beforehand what they intend to do. Speaking of his

[1] *Instit. Div.*, ii. 16.
[2] *Ib.*, iv. 27; cf. Arnobius, *Adv. Gentes*, i. 46.
[3] *Præp. Evang.*, v. 2 f.
[4] *H. E.*, v. 28.
[5] *De Civitate Dei*, viii. 22.
[6] Cf. Lactantius, *Instit. Div.*, ii. 14.

own time, and with strong expressions of assurance, Augustine says that not only Scripture testifies that angels have appeared to men with bodies which could not only be seen, but felt ; but, what is more, it is a general report, and many have personal experience of it, or have learned it from those who have knowledge of the fact, and of whose truth there is no doubt, that satyrs and fauns, generally called *Incubi*, have frequently perpetrated their peculiar wickedness ;[1] and also that certain demons, called by the Gauls *Dusii*, every day attempt and effect the same uncleanness, as witnesses equally numerous and trustworthy assert, so that it would be impertinence to deny it.[2]

Lactantius, again, ridicules the idea that there can be antipodes, and he can scarcely credit that there can be anyone so silly as to believe that there are men whose feet are higher than their heads, or that grain and trees grow downwards, and rain, snow, and hail fall upwards to the earth. After jesting at those who hold such ridiculous views, he points out that their blunders arise from supposing that the heaven is round, and the world, consequently, round like a ball, and enclosed within it. But if that were the case, it must present the same appearance to all parts of heaven, with mountains, plains, and seas, and consequently there would be no part of the earth uninhabited by men and animals. Lactantius does not know what to say to those who, having fallen into such an error, persevere in their folly (*stultitia*), and defend one vain thing by another ; but sometimes he supposes that they philosophise in jest, or knowingly defend falsehoods to display their ingenuity. Space alone prevents his proving that it is impossible for heaven to be below the earth.[3] St. Augustine, with equal boldness, declares that the stories told about the antipodes—that is to say, that there are men whose feet are against our footsteps, and upon whom the sun rises when it sets to us—are not to be believed. Such an assertion is not supported by any historical evidence, but rests upon mere conjecture, based on the rotundity of the earth. But those who maintain such a theory do not consider that, even if the earth be round, it does not follow that the opposite side is not covered with water. Besides, if it be not, why should it be inhabited, seeing that, on

[1] "*Improbos sæpe exstitisse mulieribus, et earum appetisse ac peregisse concubitum.*"

[2] *De Civ. Dei.*, xv. 23. So undeniable was the existence of these evil spirits, *Incubi* and *Succubi*, considered, and so real their wicked practices, that Pope Innocent VIII. denounced them in a Papal Bull in 1484. Burton most seriously believed in them, as he shows in his *Anatomy of Melancholy* (iii. 2). Similar demons are frequently mentioned in the Talmudic literature. Cf. Eisenmenger, *Entd. Judenthum*, i., p. 374 ; ii., p. 421 ff., 426 ff.

[3] *Instit. Div.*, iii. 24.

the one hand, it is in no way possible that the Scriptures can lie, and, on the other, it is too absurd (*nimisque absurdum est*) to affirm that any men can have traversed such an immensity of ocean to establish the human race there from that one first man Adam?[1]

Clement of Rome had no doubt of the truth of the story of the Phœnix,[2] that wonderful bird of Arabia and the adjoining countries which lives 500 years, at the end of which time, its dissolution being at hand, it builds a nest of spices, in which it dies. From the decaying flesh, however, a worm is generated, which, being strengthened by the juices of the bird, produces feathers and is transformed into a phœnix. Clement adds that it then flies away with the nest containing the bones of its defunct parent to the city of Heliopolis in Egypt, and in full daylight and in the sight of all men it lays them on the altar of the sun. On examining their registers, the priests find that the bird has returned precisely at the completion of the 500 years. This bird, Clement considers, is an emblem of the Resurrection.[3] So does Tertullian, who repeats the story with equal confidence.[4] It is likewise referred to in the Apostolic Constitutions.[5] Celsus quotes the narrative in his work against Christianity as an instance of the piety of irrational creatures, and although Origen, in reply, while admitting that the story is indeed recorded, puts in a cautious "if it be true," he proceeds to account for the phenomenon on the ground that God may have made this isolated creature in order that men might admire not the bird, but its creator.[6] Cyril of Jerusalem likewise quotes the story from Clement.[7] The author of the almost canonical Epistle of Barnabas, explaining the typical meaning of the code of Moses regarding clean and unclean animals which were or were not to be eaten, states as a fact that the hare annually increases the number of its *foramina*, for it has

[1] *De Civ. Dei*, xvi. 9. The Roman Clement, in an eloquent passage on the harmony of the universe, speaks of "the unsearchable places of abysses and the inexplicable arrangements of the lower world," and of "the ocean, impassable to man, and the worlds beyond it" (*Ep. ad Corinth.*, xx.). Origen refers to this passage in the following terms: "Clement, indeed, a disciple of the Apostles, makes mention also of those whom the Greeks call Ἀντίχθονες, and of those parts of the orb of the earth to which neither can any of our people approximate, nor can any of those who are there cross over to us, which he called 'worlds,' saying," etc. (*De Principiis*, ii. 3, § 6). Such views, however, were general.

[2] The Talmud speaks frequently of the Phœnix. It is not subject to the angel of death, but is immortal, because when Eve offered it, together with all other created things, the forbidden fruit to eat, it alone refused. See authorities, Eisenmenger, *Entd. Jud.*, i., p. 371, p. 867 ff.

[3] *Ep. ad Corinth.*, xxix. [4] *De Resurr.*, § 13. [5] v. 7.

[6] *Contra Cels.*, iv. 98. The same fable is referred to by Herodotus (ii. 73), and also by Pliny (*Nat. Hist.*, x. 2).

[7] *Catech.*, xviii. 8.

as many as the years it lives.[1] He also mentions that the hyena changes its sex every year, being alternately male and female.[2] Tertullian also points out as a recognised fact the annual change of sex of the hyena, and he adds: "I do not mention the stag, since itself is the witness of its own age; feeding on the serpent, it languishes into youth from the working of the poison."[3] The geocentric theory of the Church, which elevated man into the supreme place in the universe, and considered creation in general to be solely for his use, naturally led to the misinterpretation of all cosmical phenomena. Such spectacles as eclipses and comets were universally regarded as awful portents of impending evil, signs of God's anger, and forerunners of national calamities.[4] We have already referred to the account given by Josephus of the portents which were supposed to announce the coming destruction of the Holy City, amongst which were a star shaped like a sword, a comet, and other celestial phenomena. Volcanoes were considered openings into hell, and not only does Tertullian hold them to be so, but he asks, Who will not deem these punishments sometimes inflicted upon mountains as examples of the judgments which menace the wicked?[5]

[1] "Ὅτα γὰρ ἔτη ζῇ, τοσαύτας ἔχει τρύπας. C. X.

[2] C. X. He also says of the weasel: Τὸ γὰρ ζῶον τοῦτο τῷ στόματι κύει. Cf. Origen, *Contra Cels.*, iv. 93; Clement of Alex. refers to the common belief regarding these animals. *Paedag.*, ii. 10.

[3] "*Hyena, si observes, sexus annalis est, marem et feminam alternat. Taceo cervum quod et ipse aetatis suae arbiter, serpente pastus, veneno languescit in juventutem*" (*De Pallio*, § 3).

[4] Cf. Tertullian, *Ad. Scap.*, § 3; Sozomen, *H.E.*, viii. 4, iv. 5.

[5] *De Penitentia*, § 12. Gregory the Great gives a singular account (*Dial.* iv. 30) which he had heard of a hermit who had seen Theodoric, and one of the Popes, John, in chains, cast into the crater of one of the Lipari volcanoes, which were believed to be entrances into hell.

CHAPTER V.

THE PERMANENT STREAM OF MIRACULOUS PRETENSION

We have given a most imperfect sketch of some of the opinions and superstitions prevalent at the time of Jesus, and when the books of the New Testament were written. These, as we have seen, continued with little or no modification throughout the first centuries of our era. It must, however, be remembered that the few details we have given, omitting most of the grosser particulars, are the views deliberately expressed by the most educated and intelligent part of the community, and that it would have required infinitely darker colours adequately to have portrayed the dense ignorance and superstition of the mass of the Jews. It is impossible to receive the report of supposed marvellous occurrences from an age and people like this without the gravest suspicion. Even so thorough a defender of miracles as Newman admits that "Witnesses must be not only honest, but competent also; that is, such as have ascertained the facts which they attest, or who report after examination";[1] and although the necessities of his case oblige him to assert that "the testimony of men of science and general knowledge" must not be required, he admits, under the head of "deficiency of examination," that "Enthusiasm, ignorance, and habitual credulity are defects which no number of witnesses removes."[2] We have shown how rank were these "defects" at the commencement of the Christian era, and among the chief witnesses for Christianity. Miracles which spring from such a hot bed of superstition are too natural in such a soil to be objects of surprise and, in losing their exceptional character, their claims upon attention are proportionately weakened, if not altogether destroyed. Preternatural interference with the affairs of life and the phenomena of nature was the rule in those days, not the exception, and miracles, in fact, had lost all novelty and, through familiarity, had become degraded into mere commonplace. The Gospel miracles were not original in their character, but were substantially mere repetitions of similar wonders well known among the Jews, or commonly supposed to be of daily occurrence even at that time. In fact, the idea of such miracles, in such an age and performed among such a people, as the attestation of a

[1] *Two Essays*, etc., p. 78. [2] *Ib.*, p. 81.

supernatural Revelation, may with singular propriety be ascribed to the mind of that period, but can scarcely be said to bear any traces of the divine. Indeed, anticipating for a moment a part of our subject regarding which we shall have more to say hereafter, we may remark that, so far from being original either in its evidence or form, almost every religion which has been taught in the world has claimed the same divine character as Christianity, and has surrounded the person and origin of its central figure with the same supernatural mystery. Even the great heroes of history, long before our era, had their immaculate conception and miraculous birth.

There can be no doubt that the writers of the New Testament shared the popular superstitions of the Jews. We have already given more than one instance of this, and now we have only to refer for a moment to one class of these superstitions, the belief in demoniacal possession and origin of disease, involving clearly both the existence of demons and their power over the human race. It would be an insult to the understanding of those who are considering this question to pause here to prove that the historical books of the New Testament speak in the clearest and most unmistakable terms of actual demoniacal possession. Now, what has become of this theory of disease? The Archbishop of Dublin is probably the only one who asserts the reality of demoniacal possession formerly and at the present day,[1] and in this we must say that he is consistent. Milman, on the other hand, who spoke with the enlightenment of the nineteenth century, "has no scruple in avowing *his* opinion on the subject of demoniacs to be that of Joseph Mede, Lardner, Dr. Mead, Paley, and all the learned modern writers. It was a kind of insanity.....and nothing was more probable than that lunacy should take the turn and speak the language of the prevailing superstition of the times."[2] The Dean, as well as "all the learned modern writers" to whom he refers, felt the difficulty; but, in seeking to evade it, they sacrifice the Gospels. They overlook the fact that the writers of these narratives not only themselves adopt "the prevailing superstition of the times," but represent Jesus as doing so with equal completeness. There is no possibility, for instance, of evading such statements as those in the miracle of the country of the Gadarenes, where the objectivity of the demons is so fully recognised that, on being cast out of the man, they are represented as requesting to be allowed to go into the herd of swine; and, being permitted by Jesus to do so, the entry of the demons into the swine is at once signalised by the herd running violently down the cliff into the

[1] *Notes on Miracles*, p. 164 f.
[2] *History of Christianity*, i., p. 217, note (e).

lake, and being drowned.[1] Archbishop Trench adopts no such ineffectual evasion, but rightly objects: "Our Lord Himself uses language which is not reconcilable with any such explanation. He everywhere speaks of demoniacs not as persons of disordered intellects, but as subjects and thralls of an alien spiritual might; He addresses the evil spirit as distinct from the man: 'Hold thy peace, and come out of him'"; and he concludes that "our idea of Christ's absolute veracity, apart from the value of the truth which He communicated, forbids us to suppose that He could have spoken as He did, being perfectly aware all the while that there was no corresponding reality to justify the language which He used."[2] Milman, on the other hand, finds "a very strong reason," which he does not remember to have seen urged with sufficient force, "which may have contributed to induce our Lord to adopt the current language on the point. The disbelief in these spiritual influences was one of the characteristics of the unpopular sect of the Sadducees. A departure from the common language, or the endeavour to correct this inveterate error, would have raised an immediate outcry against Him from His watchful and malignant adversaries as an unbelieving Sadducee."[3] Such ascription of politic deception for the sake of popularity might be intelligible in an ordinary case, but when referred to the central personage of a Divine revelation, who is said to be God incarnate, it is perfectly astounding. The Archbishop, however, rightly deems that if Jesus knew that the Jewish belief in demoniacal possession was baseless, and that Satan did not exercise such power over the bodies or spirits of men, there would be in such language "that absence of agreement between thoughts and words in which the essence of a lie consists."[4] It is difficult to say whether the dilemma of the Dean or of the Archbishop is the greater—the one obliged to sacrifice the moral character of Jesus in order to escape the admission for Christianity of untenable superstition, the other obliged to adopt the superstition in order to support the veracity of the language. At least, the course of the Archbishop is consistent, and worthy of respect. The attempt to eliminate the superstitious diagnosis of the disease, and yet to preserve intact the miraculous cure, is quite ineffectual.

Dr. Trench anticipates the natural question, why there are no demoniacs now, if there were so many in those days,[5] and he is logically compelled to maintain that there may still be persons

[1] Luke viii. 26, 33; Mark v. 12, 13; cf. Matt. viii. 28, 34. In the latter Gospel the miracle is said to be performed in the country of the Gergesenes, and there are two demoniacs instead of one.

[2] *Notes on Miracles*, p. 152 f.

[3] Milman, *History of Christianity*, i., p. 218, note.

[4] *Notes on Miracles*, p. 154.

[5] *Ib.*, p. 163.

possessed. "It may well be a question, moreover," he says, "if an apostle, or one with apostolic discernment of spirits, were to enter into a madhouse now, how many of the sufferers there he might not recognise as possessed?"[1] There can scarcely be a question upon the point at all, for such a person issuing direct from that period, without subsequent scientific enlightenment, would most certainly pronounce them all "possessed." It did not, however, require an apostle, nor even one with apostolic discernment of spirits, to recognise the possessed at that time. All those who are represented as being brought to Jesus to be healed are described by their friends as having a devil or being possessed, and there was no form of disease more general or more commonly recognised by the Jews. For what reason has the recognition of, and belief in, demoniacal possession passed away with the ignorance and superstition which were then prevalent?

It is important to remember that the theory of demoniacal possession, and its supposed cure by means of exorcism and invocations, was most common among the Jews long before the commencement of the Christian era. As casting out devils was the most common type of Christian miracles, so it was the commonest belief and practice of the Jewish nation. Christianity merely shared the national superstition, and changed nothing but the form of exorcism. Christianity did not, through a "clearer perception of spirits," therefore, originate the belief in demoniacal possession, or first recognise its victims; nor did such superior enlightenment accompany the superior morality of Christianity as to detect the ignorant fallacy. In the Old Testament we find the most serious evidence of the belief in demonology and witchcraft. The laws against them set the example of that unrelenting severity with which sorcery was treated for so many centuries. We read in Exodus xxii. 18: "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Levit. xix. 31: "Regard not them which have familiar spirits, neither seek after wizards to be defiled by them." Levit. xx. 6: "And the soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits, and after wizards, to go a-whoring after them, I will even set my face against that soul, and cut him off from among his people"; and verse 27: "A man also, or a woman, that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death; they shall stone them with stones; their blood shall be upon them." Deut. xviii. 10: "There shall not be found among you anyone that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or an enchanter, or a witch; 11. Or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard,

[1] *Notes on Miracles*, p. 165. In a note the Archbishop says that "he understands that Esquirol recognises demoniacs now, and that there could not be a higher authority."

or a necromancer ; 12. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord," etc. The passages which assert the reality of demonology and witchcraft, however, are much too numerous to permit their citation here. But not only did Christianity thus inherit the long-prevalent superstition, but it transmitted it intact to succeeding ages ; and there can be no doubt that this demonology, with its consequent and inevitable belief in witchcraft, sorcery, and magic, continued so long to prevail throughout Christendom, as much through the authority of the sacred writings and the teaching of the Church as through the superstitious ignorance of Europe.

It would be impossible to select for illustration any type of the Gospel miracles whose fundamental principle — belief in the reality, malignant action, and power of demons, and in the power of man to control them — has received fuller or more permanent living acceptance from posterity, down to very recent times, than the cure of disease ascribed to demoniacal influence. The writings of the Fathers are full of the belief ; the social history of Europe teems with it. The more pious the people, the more firm was their conviction of its reality. From times antecedent to Christianity, until medical science slowly came into existence, every form of disease was ascribed to demons. Madness, idiotcy, epilepsy, and every shape of hysteria were the commonest forms of their malignity ; and the blind, the dumb, and the deformed were regarded as unquestionable victims of their malice. Every domestic calamity, from the convulsions of a child to the death of a cow, was unhesitatingly attributed to their agency. The more ignorant the community, the greater the number of its possessed. Belief in the power of sorcery, witchcraft, and magic was inherent in the superstition, and the universal prevalence shows how catholic was the belief in demoniacal influence. The practice of these arts is solemnly denounced as sin in the New Testament and throughout Patristic literature, and the Church has in all ages fulminated against it. No accusation was more common than that of practising sorcery, and no class escaped from the fatal suspicion. Popes were charged with the crime, and bishops were found guilty of it. St. Cyprian was said to have been a magician before he became a Christian and a Father of the Church.[1] Athanasius was accused of sorcery before the Synod of Tyre.[2] Not only the illiterate, but even the learned, in the estimation of their age, believed in it. No heresy was ever persecuted with more unrelenting hatred. Popes have issued bulls vehemently anathematising witches and sorcerers, councils have proscribed

[1] Greg. Nazianz., *Orat.*, xviii.
[2] Theodoret, *H. E.*, i. 30 ; cf. Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, ii., p. 378.

them, ecclesiastical courts have consigned tens of thousands of persons suspected of being such to the stake, monarchs have written treatises against them and invented tortures for their conviction, and every nation in Europe, and almost every generation, have passed the most stringent laws against them. Upon no point has there ever been greater unanimity of belief. Church and State have vied with each other for the suppression of the abominable crime. Every phenomenon of nature, every unwelcome occurrence of social life, as well as every natural disease, has been ascribed to magic and demons. The historical records of Europe are filled with the deliberate trial and conviction, upon what was deemed evidence, of thousands of sorcerers and witches. Hundreds have been found guilty of exercising demoniacal influence over the elements, from Sopater the philosopher, executed under Constantine for preventing, by adverse winds, the arrival of corn ships at Constantinople, to Dr. Fian and other witches horribly tortured and burnt for causing a stormy passage on the return of James I. from Denmark.[1] Thousands of men and tens of thousands of women have been done to death by every conceivable torment for causing sickness or calamity by sorcery, or for flying through the air to attend the witches' sabbath. When scepticism as to the reality of the demoniacal powers of sorcery tardily began to arise, it was fiercely reprobated by the Church as infidelity. Even so late as the seventeenth century, a man like Sir Thomas Browne not only did not include the belief among the vulgar errors which he endeavoured to expose, but, on the contrary, wrote: "For my part, I have ever believed, and do now know, that there are witches. They that doubt of them do not only deny them, but spirits; and are obliquely, and upon consequence, a sort not of infidels, but Atheists."[2] In 1664 Sir Thomas Hale, in passing sentence of death against two women convicted of being witches, declared that the reality of witchcraft was undeniable, because "first, the Scriptures had affirmed so much; and, secondly, the wisdom of all nations had provided laws against such persons, which is an argument of their confidence in such a crime."[3] Even the eighteenth century was stained with the blood of persons tortured and executed for sorcery.

Notwithstanding all this persistent and unanimous confirmation,

[1] Pitcairn's *Criminal Trials of Scotland*, i., pp. 213, 223.

[2] *Religio Medici*, *Works* (Bohn), ii., p. 43 f.

[3] *Collection of Rare and Curious Tracts Relating to Witchcraft*, London, 1838. Cf. Lecky, *Hist. of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe*, 3rd ed., 1866, i., p. 120. The reader is referred to this able work, as well as to Buckle's *Hist. of Civilisation*, for much interesting information regarding magic and witchcraft, as well as religious superstition and miraculous pretensions generally.

we ask again: What has now become of the belief in demoniacal possession and sorcery? It has utterly disappeared. "Joseph Mede, Lardner, Dr. Mead, Paley, and all the learned modern writers" with Dean Milman, as we have seen, explain it away, and such a theory of disease and elemental disturbance is universally recognised to have been a groundless superstition. The countless number of persons tormented and put to death for the supposed crime of witchcraft and sorcery were mere innocent victims to ignorance and credulity. At the commencement of our era every disease was ascribed to the agency of demons simply because the nature of disease was not understood, and the writers of the Gospels were not, in this respect, one whit more enlightened than the Jews. The progress of science, however, has not only dispelled the superstitious theory as regards disease in our time; its effects are retrospective. Science not only declares the ascription of disease to demoniacal possession or malignity to be an idle superstition now, but it equally repudiates the assumption of such a cause at any time. The diseases referred by the Gospels, and by the Jews of that time, to the action of devils, exist now, but they are known to proceed from purely physical causes. The same superstition and medical ignorance would enunciate the same diagnosis at the present day. The superstition and ignorance, however, have passed away, and with them the demoniacal theory. In that day the theory was as baseless as in this. This is the logical conclusion of every educated man.

It is obvious that, with the necessary abandonment of the theory of "possession" and demoniacal origin of disease, the largest class of miracles recorded in the Gospels is at once exploded. The asserted cause of the diseases of this class, said to have been miraculously healed, must be recognised to be a mere vulgar superstition, and the narratives of such miracles, ascribing as they do, in perfect simplicity, distinct objectivity to the supposed "possessing" demons, and reporting their very words and actions, at once assume the character of mere imaginative and fabulous writings based upon superstitious tradition, and cannot be accepted as the sober and intelligent report of eye-witnesses. We shall presently see how far this inference is supported by the literary evidence regarding the date and composition of the Gospels.

The deduction, however, does not end here. It is clear that, this large class of Gospel miracles being due to the superstition of an ignorant and credulous age, the insufficiency of the evidence for any of the other supposed miraculous occurrences narrated in the same documents becomes at once apparent. Nothing but the most irrefragable testimony could possibly warrant belief in statements of supernatural events which contradict all experience, and

are opposed to all science. When these statements, however, are not only rendered, *à priori*, suspicious by their proceeding from a period of the grossest superstition and credulity, but it becomes evident that a considerable part of them are due solely to that superstition and credulity, by which, moreover, the rest may likewise be most naturally explained, they cannot stand against the opposing conviction of invariable experience. The force of the testimony is gone. We are far from using this language in an offensive sense concerning the Gospel narratives, which, by the simple faith of the writers, present the most noble aspect of the occurrences of which superstition is capable. Indeed, viewed as compositions gradually rising out of pious tradition, and representing the best spirit of their times, the Gospels, even in ascribing such miracles to Jesus, are a touching illustration of the veneration excited by his elevated character. Devout enthusiasm surrounded his memory with the tradition of the highest exhibitions of power within the range of Jewish imagination, and that these conceptions represent merely an idealised form of prevalent superstition was not only natural, but inevitable. We shall hereafter fully examine the character of the Gospels, but it will be sufficient here to point out that none of these writings lays claim to any special inspiration, or in the slightest degree pretends to be more than a human composition,[1] and subject to the errors of human history.

We have seen how incompetent those who lived at the time when the Gospel miracles are supposed to have taken place were to furnish reliable testimony regarding such phenomena; and the gross mistake committed in regard to the largest class of these miracles, connected with demoniacal possession, altogether destroys the value of the evidence for the rest, and connects the whole, as might have been expected, with the general superstition and ignorance of the period. It may be well to inquire, further, whether there is any valid reason for excepting any of the miracles of Scripture from this fate, and whether there was any special "Age of Miracles" at all, round which a privileged line can be drawn on any reasonable ground.

We have already pointed out that the kind of evidence which is supposed to attest the Divine revelation of Christianity, so far from being invented for the purpose, was so hackneyed, so to speak, as scarcely to attract the notice of the nation to which the revelation was, in the first instance, addressed. Not only did the

[1] See, for instance, the reasons for the composition of the third Gospel stated in the first four verses. It was clearly intended in the first instance to be a private document for the use of Theophilus.

Old Testament contain accounts of miracles of every one of the types related in the New, but most of them were believed to be commonly performed both before and after the commencement of the Christian era. That demons were successfully exorcised, and diseases cured, by means of spells and incantations, was never doubted by the Jewish nation. Satanic miracles, moreover, are not only recognised throughout the Old and New Testaments, but formed a leading feature of the Patristic creed. The early Christians were as ready as the heathen to ascribe every inexplicable occurrence to supernatural agency, and the only difference between them was as to the nature of that agency. The Jews and their heathen neighbours were too accustomed to supposed preternatural occurrences to feel much surprise or incredulity at the account of Christian miracles; and it is characteristic of the universal superstition of the period that the Fathers did not dream of denying the reality of Pagan miracles, but merely attributed them to demons, whilst they asserted the Divine origin of their own. The reality of the powers of sorcery was never questioned. Every marvel and every narrative of supernatural interference with human affairs seemed matter of course to the superstitious credulity of the age. However much miracles are exceptions to the order of nature, they have always been the rule in the history of ignorance. In fact, the excess of belief in them throughout many centuries of darkness is fatal to their claims to credence now. The Christian miracles are rendered as suspicious from their place in a long sequence of similar occurrences, as they are by being exceptions to the sequence of natural phenomena. It would indeed be extraordinary if whole cycles of miracles occurring before and since those of the Gospels, and in connection with every religion, could be repudiated as fables, and those alone maintained as genuine.

No attempt is made to deny the fact that miracles are common to all times and to all religious creeds. Newman states among the conclusions of his essay on the miracles of early ecclesiastical history: "That there was no Age of Miracles, after which miracles ceased; that there have been at all times true miracles and false miracles, true accounts and false accounts; that no authoritative guide is supplied to us for drawing the line between the two."[1] Dr. Mozley also admits that morbid love of the marvellous in the human race "has produced a constant stream of miraculous pretension in the world, which accompanies man wherever he is found, and is a part of his mental and physical history."[2] Ignorance and its invariable attendant, superstition, have done more

[1] *Two Essays on Scripture Miracles*, etc., 1870, p. 100.
[2] *Bampton Lectures*, p. 206.

than mere love of the marvellous to produce and perpetuate belief in miracles, and there cannot be any doubt that the removal of ignorance always leads to their cessation.[1] The Bampton lecturer proceeds: "Heathenism had its running stream of supernatural pretensions in the shape of prophecy, exorcism, and the miraculous cures of diseases, which the temples of Esculapius recorded with pompous display."[2] So far from the Gospel miracles being original, and a presentation, for the first time, of phenomena until then unknown and unlikely to suggest themselves to the mind, "Jewish supernaturalism was indeed going on side by side with our Lord's miracles."[3] Dr. Mozley, however, rebuts the inference which has been drawn from this, "That His miracles could not, in the very nature of the case, be evidences of His distinctive teaching and mission, inasmuch as miracles were common to Himself and His opponents," by the assertion that a very marked distinction exists between the Gospel miracles and all others.[4] He perfectly recognises the consequence if such a distinction cannot be clearly demonstrated. "The criticism, therefore, which *evidential* miracles, or miracles which serve as evidence of a revelation, must come up to, if they are to accomplish the object for which they are designed, involves at the outset this condition—that the evidence of such miracles must be distinguishable from the evidences of this permanent stream of miraculous pretension in the world; that such miracles must be separated by an interval not only from the facts of the order of nature, but also from the common running miraculous, which is the simple offshoot of human nature. Can evidential miracles be inserted in this promiscuous mass, so as not to be confounded with it, but to assert their own truth and distinctive source? If they cannot, there is an end to the proof of a revelation by miracles; if they can, it remains to see whether the Christian miracles are thus distinguishable, and whether their nature, their object, and their evidence vindicate their claim to this distinctive truth and Divine source."[5]

Now, regarding this distinction between Gospel and other miracles, it must be observed that the religious feeling which influenced the composition of the Scripture narratives of miracles naturally led to the exclusion of all that was puerile or ignoble in the traditions preserved regarding the Great Master. The elevated character of Jesus afforded no basis for what was petty, and the devotion with which he was regarded when the Gospels were written insured the noblest treatment of his history within certain

[1] Cf. Buckle, *Hist. of Civilisation*, i., p. 373 ff.; cf. p. 122 ff.; iii., p. 35.
[2] *Bampton Lectures*, p. 206.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 209. [4] *Ib.*, p. 209. [5] *Ib.*, p. 208.

limits. We must, therefore, consider the bare facts composing the miracles, rather than the narrative of the manner in which they are said to have been produced, in order rightly to judge of the comparative features of different miracles. If we take the case of a person raised from the dead, literary skill may invest the account with more or less of dramatic interest and dignity; but, whether the main fact be surrounded with pathetic and picturesque details, as in the account of the raising of Lazarus in the fourth Gospel, or the person be simply restored to life without them, it is the fact of the resurrection which constitutes the miracle, and it is in the facts alone that we must seek distinction, disregarding and distrusting the accessories. In the one case the effect may be much more impressive, but in the other the bare raising of the dead is not a whit less miraculous. We have been accustomed to read the Gospel narratives of miracles with so much special veneration that it is now difficult to recognise how much of the distinction of these miracles is due to the composition, and to their place in the history of Jesus. No other miracles, or account of miracles, ever had such collateral advantages.

The Archbishop of Dublin says: "Few points present greater difficulties than the attempt to fix accurately the moment when these miraculous powers were withdrawn from the Church"; and he argues that they were withdrawn when it entered into what he calls its permanent state, and no longer required "these props and strengthenings of the infant plant."[1] That their retrocession was gradual he considers natural, and he imagines the fulness of Divine power as gradually waning as it was subdivided, first among the Apostles and then among the ever-multiplying members of the Church, until by sub-division it became virtually extinct, leaving as a substitute "the standing wonder of a Church."[2] This, of course, is not argument, but merely the Archbishop's fanciful explanation of a serious difficulty. The fact is, however, that the Gospel miracles were preceded and accompanied by others of the same type, and were also followed by a long succession of others, quite as well authenticated, whose occurrence only became less frequent in proportion as the diffusion of knowledge dispelled popular credulity. Even at the present day a stray miracle is from time to time reported in outlying districts, where the ignorance and superstition which formerly produced so abundant a growth of them are not yet entirely dispelled.

Papias of Hierapolis narrates a wonderful story, according to Eusebius, which he had heard from the daughters of the Apostle Philip, who lived at the same time in Hierapolis: "For he relates that a dead man was restored to life in his day."[3] Justin Martyr,

[1] *Notes on Miracles*, p. 54. [2] *Ib.*, p. 55. [3] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39.

speaking of his own time, frequently asserts that Christians still receive the gift of healing, of foreknowledge, and of prophecy,[1] and he points out to the Roman Senate, as a fact happening under their own observation, that many demoniacs throughout all the world and in their own city have been healed, and are healed, many of the Christian men among us exorcising them in the name of Jesus Christ, subduing and expelling the possessing demons out of the man, although all the other exorcists, with incantations and spells, had failed to do so.[2] Theophilus of Antioch likewise states that to his day demons are exorcised.[3] Irenæus, in the clearest manner, claims for the Church of his time the continued possession of the Divine χαρίσματα. He contrasts the miracles of the followers of Simon and Carpocrates, which he ascribes to magical illusions, with those of Christians. "For they can neither give sight to the blind," he continues, "nor to the deaf hearing, nor cast out all demons, but only those introduced by themselves —if they can even do that—nor heal the sick, the lame, the paralytic, nor those afflicted in other parts of the body, as has been often done in regard to bodily infirmity.....But so far are they from raising the dead, as the Lord raised them and the Apostles by prayer, and as frequently in the brotherhood, when the whole Church in a place made supplication with much fasting and prayer, the spirit of the dead was constrained to return, and the man was freely restored in answer to the prayers of the saints, that they do not believe this can possibly be done."[4] Dr. Mozley, who desires, for the purpose of his argument, to weaken the evidence of patristic belief in the continuance of miracles, says, regarding this last passage on raising the dead: "But the reference is so vague that it possesses but little weight as testimony."[5] The language of Irenæus is vague only in so far as specific detailed instances are not given of the miracles referred to; but no language could be more definite or explicit to express his meaning—namely, the assertion that the prayers of Christian communities had frequently restored the dead to life. Eusebius, who quotes the passage and who has preserved to us the original Greek, clearly recognised this. He says, when making the quotations: "In the second book of the same work he [Irenæus] testifies that up to his time tokens of Divine and miraculous power remained in some Churches."[6] In the next chapter, Irenæus further says: "On which account also his true disciples, receiving

[1] Cf. *Dial. c. Tryph.*, xxxix., lxxxii., lxxxviii., etc.
[2] *Apol.*, ii. 6, cf. *Dial. c. Tryphon.*, xxx., lxxvi., lxxxv., etc.
[3] *Ad Autolycum*, ii. 8.
[4] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, ii. 31, § 2; Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 7.
[5] *Bampton Lectures*, Note i. on Lecture VIII. (p. 210), p. 371.
[6] *H. E.*, v. 7.

grace from him, work (miracles) in his name for the benefit of the rest of mankind, according to the gift received from him by each of them. For some do certainly and truly (*βεβαίως καὶ ἀληθῶς*) cast out demons, so that frequently those very men who have thus been cleansed from the evil spirits both believe and are now in the Church. And some have foreknowledge of future occurrences and visions and prophetic utterances. Others heal the sick by the imposition of hands, and make them whole. Indeed, as we have already stated, even the dead have been raised up, and have remained with us for many years. And what more shall I say? It is not possible to state the number of the gifts which the Church throughout the world has received from God in the name of Jesus Christ, crucified under Pontius Pilate, and which she each day employs for the benefit of the heathen," etc.[1]

Tertullian speaks with the most perfect assurance of miracles occurring in his day, and of the power of healing and of casting out devils still possessed by Christians. In one place, for instance, after asserting the power which they have generally over demons, so that, if a person possessed by a devil be brought before one of the Roman tribunals, a follower of Christ can at once compel the wicked spirit within him to confess that he is a demon, even if he had before asserted himself to be a god, he proceeds to say: "So, at our touch and breathing, violently affected by the contemplation and representation of those fires [of hell], they [demons] also depart at our command out of bodies, reluctant and complaining, and put to shame in your presence."[2] He declares that, although dreams are chiefly inflicted upon us by demons, yet they are also sent by God, and, indeed, "almost the greater part of mankind derive their knowledge concerning God from visions."[3] He, elsewhere, states that he himself knows that a brother was severely castigated by a vision the same night on which his slaves had, without his knowledge, done something reprehensible.[4] He narrates, as an instance of the continued possession of spiritual *charismata* by Christians: "There is at this day amongst us a sister who has the gift of revelations, which she receives in church amidst the solemnities of the Lord's Day by ecstasy in the spirit; she converses with angels, and sometimes also with the Lord, and she both hears and sees mysteries (*sacramenta*), and she reads the hearts of some men, and prescribes medicines to those who are in need."[5] Tertullian goes on to say that, after the people were

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 7; *Adv. Hær.*, ii. 32, § 4; cf. v. 6, § i.; cf. Theophilus, *Ad Autol.*, i. 13.

[2] *Apologeticus*, § 23, cf. *De Idol.*, § 11; *De Spectac.*, § 29; *De Exhort. Castit.*, § 10; *Ad Scapulam*, § 4; *De Anima*, § 57.

[3] *De Anima*, § 47; *De Idol.*, § 15.

[4] *De Idol.*, § 15.

[5] *De Anima*, § 9.

dismissed from the church, this sister was in the regular habit of reporting what she had seen, and that most diligent inquiries were made in order to test the truth of her communications;[1] and, after narrating a vision of a disembodied soul vouchsafed to her, he states: "This is the vision, God being witness, and the Apostle[2] having foretold that such spiritual gifts should be in the Church."[3] Further on Tertullian relates a story within his own knowledge: "I know the case of a woman, born within the fold of the Church, who was in the prime of life and beauty. After being but once, and only a short time, married, having fallen asleep in peace, in the interval before interment, when the presbyter began to pray, as she was being made ready for burial, at the first breath of prayer she removed her hands from her sides, folded them in the attitude of supplication, and again, when the last rites were over, restored them to their former position."[4] He then mentions another story known amongst them—that a dead body in a cemetery moved itself in order to make room beside it for another body;[5] and then he remarks: "If similar cases are also reported amongst the heathen, we conclude that God displays signs of his power for the consolation of his own people, and as a testimony to others."[6] Again, he mentions cases where Christians had cured persons of demoniacal possession, and adds: "And how many men of position (for we do not speak of the vulgar) have been delivered either from devils or from diseases?"[7] Tertullian, in the same place, refers to the miracle of the "Thundering Legion,"[8] and he exclaims: "When, indeed, have not droughts been removed by our prayers and fastings?"[9] Minucius Felix speaks of the casting out of devils from sick persons by Christians in his own day as a matter of public notoriety even among Pagans.[10] St. Cyprian echoes the same assertions.[11] He likewise mentions cases of miraculous punishment inflicted upon persons who had lapsed from the Christian faith. One of these, who ascended the Capitol to make denial of Christ, suddenly became dumb after he had spoken the words.[12] Another—a woman—was seized by an unclean spirit even at the baths, and bit with her own teeth the impious tongue which had eaten the idolatrous food, or spoken the words, and she shortly expired in great agony.[13] He likewise maintains that Christians are admonished by God in dreams and by visions, of which he mentions instances.[14] Origen claims for Christians the

[1] *De Anima*, § 9. [2] 1 Cor. xii. 1 ff. [3] *De Anima*, § 9. [4] *Ib.*, § 51.
[5] *Ib.* § 51. [6] *Ib.*, § 51. [7] *Ad Scapulum*, § 4.
[8] Cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 5. [9] *Ad Scapulum*, § 4. [10] *Octavius*, § 27.
[11] *Tract*, ii., *De Idol. Vanitate*, § 7; *Ad Demetrianum*, § 15.
[12] *De Lapsis*, § 24. [13] *Ib.*, § 24, cf. §§ 25, 26.
[14] *Ep.*, liii., §§ 1–5; lxii., § 17; lxviii., §§ 9, 10 (ed. Migne); *D. Mortalitate*, § 19.

power still to expel demons and to heal diseases in the name of Jesus,[1] and he states that he had seen many persons so cured of madness and countless other evils, which could not be otherwise cured by men or devils.[2] Lactantius repeatedly asserts the power of Christians over demons; they make them flee from bodies when they adjure them in the name of God.[3]

Passing over the numerous apocryphal writings of the early centuries of our era, in which many miracles are recorded, we find in the pages of Eusebius narratives of many miraculous occurrences. Many miracles are ascribed to Narcissus, Bishop of Jerusalem, of which Eusebius relates several. While the vigils of the great watch of the Passover were being kept, the oil failed; whereupon Narcissus commanded that water from the neighbouring well should be poured into the lamps. Having prayed over the water, it was changed into oil, of which a specimen had been preserved until that time.[4] On another occasion, three men having spread some vile slanders against Narcissus, which they confirmed by an oath, and with imprecations upon themselves of death by a miserable disease, of death by fire, and of blindness, respectively, if their statements were not true, omnipotent justice in each case inflicted upon the wretches the curse which each had invoked.[5] The election of Fabianus to the episcopal chair of Rome was marked by the descent of a dove from on high, which rested upon his head, as the Holy Ghost had descended upon our Saviour.[6] At Cæsarea Philippi there is a statue of Jesus Christ, which Eusebius states that he himself had seen, said to have been erected by the woman healed of the bloody issue, and on the pedestal grows a strange plant as high as the hem of the brazen garment, which is an antidote to all diseases.[7] Great miracles are recorded as taking place during the persecutions in Cæsarea.[8]

Gregory of Nyssa gives an account of many wonderful works performed by his namesake Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea, who was called *Thaumaturgus* from the miraculous power which he possessed and very freely exercised. The Virgin Mary and the Apostle John appeared to him, on one occasion, when he was in doubt as to the doctrine which he ought to preach, and, at the request of Mary, the Apostle gave him all needful instructions.[9] If his faith did not move mountains, it moved a huge rock to convert a pagan priest.[10] He drove a demon out of a heathen

[1] *Contra Cels.*, i. 67, 2, 6, 46; ii. 33; ii. 24, 28, 36.
[2] *Ib.*, iii. 24. [3] *Instit. Div.*, ii. 16, iv. 27, v. 22.
[4] Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi. 9. [5] *Ib.*, vi. 9. [6] *Ib.*, vi. 29.
[7] *Ib.*, *H. E.*, vii. 18; cf. Sozomen, *H. E.*, v. 21.
[8] Eusebius, *De Martyr. Palest.*, iv., ix.; cf. Theodoret, *H. E.*, iv. 22.
[9] Greg. Nyss., *De Vit. Greg. Thaum.*, iii., p. 545 f.
[10] *Ib.*, p. 550.

temple in which he had taken refuge, and the evil spirit could not re-enter until he gave permission.[1] Nyssen relates how St. Gregory averted an armed contest of two brothers who quarrelled about the possession of a lake on their father's property. The saint passed the night in prayer beside the lake, and in the morning it was found dried up.[2] On another occasion he rescued the country from the devastation of a mountain stream, which periodically burst the dykes by which it was restrained and inundated the plain. He went on foot to the place and, invoking the name of Christ, fixed his staff in the earth at the place where the torrent had broken through. The staff took root and became a tree, and the stream never again burst its bounds. The inhabitants of the district were converted to Christianity by this miracle. The tree was still living in Nyssen's time, and he had seen the bed of the lake covered with trees, pastures, and cottages.[3] Two vagabond Jews once attempted to deceive him. One of them lay down and pretended to be dead, while the other begged money from the saint wherewith to buy him a shroud. St. Gregory quietly took off his cloak and laid it on the man, and walked away. His companion found that he was really dead.[4] St. Gregory expelled demons from persons possessed, healed the sick, and performed many other miracles;[5] and his signs and wonders are not only attested by Gregory of Nyssa, but by St. Basil,[6] whose grandmother, St. Macrina, was brought up at Neo-Cæsarea by the immediate followers of the saint.

Athanasius, in his memoir of St. Anthony, who began to lead the life of a recluse about A.D. 270, gives particulars of many miracles performed by the saint. Although he possessed great power over demons, and delivered many persons possessed by them, Satan tormented him sadly, and he was constantly beset by legions of devils. One night Satan with a troop of evil spirits so belaboured the saint that he lay on the ground speechless and almost dead from their blows.[7] We have already referred to the case of Natalius, who was scourged by angels

[1] Greg., Nyss., *De Vit. Greg. Thaum.*, p. 548. Cf. Socrates, *H. E.*, iv. 27. He gave this permission in writing "Gregory to Satan: Enter."—Γρηγόριος τῷ Σατανᾷ, Εἴσελθε.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 555 f. [3] *Ib.*, p. 558 ff.

[4] *Ib.*, iii., p. 561 f. The same story is related of St. Epiphanius of Cyprus, and Sozomen sees no ground for doubting the veracity of either account. He states that St. Epiphanius also performed many other miracles (*H. E.*, vii. 27).

[5] *Ib.*, pp. 541, 551, 552, 553, 566, 567, 577.

[6] *De Spir. Sancto*, c. 29, tom. iii., pp. 62, 63, Bened.; cf. *Ep.* 204, p. 306.

[7] S. Athanasii, *Vita et Convers. S. Antonii*, §§ 8, Opp. tom. i., pars. ii., p. 802 ff., Bened.

during a whole night, till he was brought to repentance.[1] Upon one occasion, when St. Anthony had retired to his cell resolved to pass a time in perfect solitude, a certain soldier came to his door and remained long there knocking and supplicating the saint to come and deliver his daughter, who was tormented by a demon. At length St. Anthony addressed the man and told him to go, and if he believed in Jesus Christ and prayed to God his prayer should be fulfilled. The man believed, invoked Jesus Christ, and his daughter was delivered from the demon.[2] As Anthony was once travelling across the desert to visit another monastery, the water of the caravan failed them, and his companions in despair threw themselves on the ground. St. Anthony, however, retired a little apart, and in answer to his prayer a spring of water issued at the place where he was kneeling.[3] A man named Fronto, who was afflicted with leprosy, begged his prayers, and was ordered by the saint to go into Egypt, where he should be healed. Fronto at first refused, but, being told that he could not be healed if he remained, the sick man went believing, and as soon as he came in sight of Egypt he was made whole.[4] Another miracle was performed by Anthony at Alexandria in the presence of St. Athanasius. As they were leaving the city a woman cried after him, "Man of God, stay; my daughter is cruelly troubled by a demon"; and she entreated him to stop lest she herself should die in running after him. At the request of Athanasius and the rest, the saint paused, and, as the woman came up, her daughter fell on the ground convulsed. St. Anthony prayed in the name of Jesus Christ, and immediately the girl rose perfectly restored to health, and delivered from the evil spirit.[5] He astonished a number of pagan philosophers, who had come to dispute with him, by delivering several demoniacs, making the sign of the cross over them three times, and invoking the name of Jesus Christ.[6] It is unnecessary, however, to multiply instances of his miraculous power to drive out demons and heal diseases,[7] and to perform other wonderful works. St. Athanasius, who was himself for a long time a personal follower of St. Anthony, protests in his preface to the biography his general accuracy, he having everywhere been mindful of the truth.[8]

Hilarion, again, a disciple of St. Anthony, performed many miracles, an account of some of which is given by St. Jerome. He restored sight to a woman who had been blind for no less than

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 28.
[2] *Vita*, § 48, p. 832.
[3] *Ib.*, § 54, p. 836 f.
[4] *Ib.*, § 57, p. 839.
[5] *Ib.*, § 71, p. 849.
[6] *Ib.*, § 72, p. 849.
[7] Cf. *ib.*, §§ 55, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 70, etc.
[8] *Ib.*, p. 797.

ten years; he cast out devils, and miraculously cured many diseases. Rain fell in answer to his prayers, and he further exhibited his power over the elements by calming a stormy sea. When he was buried, ten months after his death, not only was his body as perfect as though he had been alive, but it emitted a delightful perfume. He was so favoured of God that, long after, diseases were healed and demons expelled at his tomb.[1] St. Macarius, the Egyptian, is said to have restored a dead man to life in order to convince an unbeliever of the truth of the resurrection.[2] St. Martin, of Tours, restored to life a certain catechumen who had died of a fever, and Sulpicius, his disciple, states that the man, who lived for many years after, was known to himself, although not until after the miracle. He also restored to life a servant who had hung himself.[3] He performed a multitude of other miracles, to which we need not here more minutely refer. The relics of the two martyrs Protavius and Gervasius, whose bones, with much fresh blood, the miraculous evidence of their martyrdom and identity, were discovered by St. Ambrose, worked a number of miracles. A man suffering from demoniacal possession indicated the proximity of the relics by his convulsions. St. Augustine states that he himself was in Milan when a blind man, who merely touched the cloth which covered the two bodies as they were being moved to a neighbouring church, regained his sight.[4] Paulinus relates many miracles performed by his master, St. Ambrose, himself. He not only cast out many demons and healed the sick,[5] but he also raised the dead. Whilst the saint was staying in the house of a distinguished Christian friend, his child, who a few days before had been delivered from an unclean spirit, suddenly expired. The mother, an exceedingly religious woman, full of faith and the fear of God, carried the dead boy down and laid him on the saint's bed during his absence. When St. Ambrose returned, filled with compassion for the mother and struck by her faith, he stretched himself, like Elisha, on the body of the child, praying, and restored him living to his mother. Paulinus relates this miracle with minute particulars of name and address.[6]

St. Augustine asserts that miracles are still performed in his day in the name of Jesus Christ, either by means of his sacraments or by the prayers or relics of his saints, although they are not so well known as those of old, and he gives an account of many miracles which had recently taken place.[7] After referring to the miracle

[1] Sozomen, *H. E.*, iii. 14.
[2] *Ib.*, *H. E.*, iii. 14.
[3] Sulpicius, *Vita S. Mart.*; cf. Sozomen, *H. E.*, iii. 14.
[4] Ambrose, *Epist. Class.*, i. 22; August., *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8; Paulinus, *Vita S. Ambrosii*, § 14 f.
[5] *Vita S. Ambr.*, §§ 21, 43, 44.
[6] *Ib.*, § 28.
[7] *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8.

performed by the relics of the two martyrs upon the blind man in Milan, which occurred when he was there, he goes on to narrate the miraculous cure of a friend of his own, named Innocent, formerly advocate of the prefecture in Carthage, where Augustine was, and beheld it with his own eyes (*ubi nos interfuimus et oculis aspeximus nostris*). A lady of rank in the same city was miraculously healed of an incurable cancer, and St. Augustine is indignant at the apathy of her friends which allowed so great a miracle to be so little known.[1] An inhabitant of the neighbouring town of Curubis was cured of paralysis and other ills by being baptised. When Augustine heard of this, although it was reported on very good authority, the man himself was brought to Carthage by order of the holy bishop Aurelius in order that the truth might be ascertained. Augustine states that on one occasion, during his absence, a tribunitian man among them named Hesperius, who had a farm close by called Zubedi, in the Fussalian district, begged one of the Christian presbyters to go and drive away some evil spirits whose malice sorely afflicted his servants and cattle. One of the presbyters accordingly went and offered the sacrifice of the body of Christ with earnest prayer, and by the mercy of God the evil was removed. Now, Hesperius happened to have received from one of his friends a piece of the sacred earth of Jerusalem, where Jesus Christ was buried and rose again the third day, and he had hung it up in his room to protect himself from the evil spirits. When his house had been freed from them, however, he begged St. Augustine and his colleague Maximinus, who happened to be in that neighbourhood, to come to him, and, after telling them all that had happened, he prayed them to bury the piece of earth in some place where Christians could assemble for the worship of God. They consented and did as he desired. A young peasant of the neighbourhood who was paralytic, hearing of this, begged that he might be carried without delay to the holy spot, where he offered up prayer, and rose up and went away on his feet perfectly cured. About thirty miles from Hippo, at a farm called Victoriana, there was a memorial to the two martyrs Protavius and Gervasius. To this, Augustine relates, was brought a young man who, having gone one summer day at noon to water his horse in the river, was possessed by a demon. The lady to whom the place belonged came, according to her custom, in the evening with her servants and some holy women to sing hymns and pray. On hearing them, the demoniac started up and seized the altar with a terrible shudder, without daring to move and as if bound to it, and the demon, praying with a loud voice for mercy, confessed where and when he had entered

[1] *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8.

into the young man. At last the demon named all the members of his body, with threats to cut them off as he made his exit, and saying these words came out of him. In doing so, however, the eye of the youth fell from its socket on to his cheek, retained only by a small vein, as by a root, whilst the pupil became altogether white. Well pleased, however, that the young man had been freed from the evil spirit, they returned the eye to its place as well as they could, and bound it up with a handkerchief, praying fervently, and one of his relatives said: "God, who drove out the demon at the prayer of his saints, can also restore the sight." On removing the bandage seven days after, the eye was found perfectly whole. St. Augustine knew a girl of Hippo who was delivered from a demon by the application of oil, with which had mingled the tears of the presbyter who was praying for her. He also knew a bishop who prayed for a youth possessed by a demon, although he had not even seen him, and the young man was at once cured.

Augustine further gives particulars of many miracles performed by the relics of the most glorious martyr Stephen.[1] By their virtue the blind receive their sight, the sick are healed, the impenitent converted, and the dead are restored to life. "Andurus is the name of an estate," Augustine says, "where there is a church, and in it is a shrine dedicated to the martyr Stephen. A certain little boy was playing in the court, when unruly bullocks drawing a waggon crushed him with the wheel, and immediately he lay in the agonies of death. Then his mother raised him up, and placed him at the shrine, and he not only came to life again, but had manifestly received no injury. A certain religious woman, who lived in a neighbouring property called Caspalianus, being dangerously ill and her life despaired of, her tunic was carried to the same shrine; but before it was brought back she had expired. Nevertheless, her relatives covered the body with this tunic, and she received back the spirit and was made whole. At Hippo a certain man named Bassus, a Syrian, was praying at the shrine of the same martyr for his daughter, who was sick and in great peril, and he had brought her dress with him; when lo! some of his household came running to announce to him that she was dead. But, as he was engaged in prayer, they were stopped by his friends, who prevented their telling him, lest he should give way to his grief in public. When he returned to his house, which already resounded with the wailing of his household, he cast over the body of his daughter her mantle, which he had with him, and immediately she was restored to life. Again, in the same city, the son of a certain man among us named Irenæus, a collector of

[1] *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8.

taxes, became sick and died. As the dead body lay, and they were preparing, with wailing and lamentation, to bury it, one of his friends, consoling him, suggested that the body should be anointed with oil from the same martyr. This was done, and the child came to life again. In the same way a man among us named Elusinus, formerly a tribune, laid the body of his child, who had died from sickness, on a memorial of the martyr which is in his villa in the suburbs, and after he had prayed, with many tears, he took up the child living."[1] St. Augustine further relates some remarkable cases: "Eucharius, a presbyter from Spain, resided at Calama, who had for a long time suffered from stone. By the relics of the same martyr, which the Bishop Possidius brought to him, he was made whole. The same presbyter, afterwards succumbing to another disease, lay dead, so that they were already binding his hands. Succour came from the relics of the martyr, for the tunic of the presbyter being brought back from the relics and placed upon his body, he revived."[2]

Two objections have been raised to the importance of the miracles reported by St. Augustine, to which we must briefly refer.[3] (1) That "his notices of the cases in which persons had been raised to life again are so short, bare, and summary that they evidently represent no more than mere report, and report of a very vague kind." (2) "That, with the preface which Augustine prefixes to his list, he cannot be said even to profess to guarantee the truth or accuracy of the different instances contained in it."

It is true that in several cases Augustine gives the account of miraculous cures at greater length than those of restoration to life. It seems to us that this is almost inevitable at all times, and that the reason is obvious. Where the miracle consists merely of the cure of disease, details are naturally given to show the nature and intensity of the sickness, and they are necessary not only for the comprehension of the cure, but to show its importance. In the case of restoration to life, the mere statement of the death and assertion of the subsequent resurrection exclude all need of details. The pithy *reddita est vitæ*, or *factum est et revixit*, is more striking than any more prolix narrative. In fact, the greater the miracle the more natural is conciseness and simplicity; and, practically, we find that Augustine gives a more lengthy and verbose report of trifling cures, whilst he relates the more important with greater brevity and force. He narrates many of his cases of miraculous cure, however, as briefly as those in which the dead are raised. We have quoted the latter, and the reader must judge whether they are unduly curt. One thing may be

[1] *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8. [2] *Ib.*, xxii. 8.
[3] Mozley, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 372 f.

affirmed, that nothing of importance is omitted, and in regard to essential details they are explicit as the mass of other cases reported. In every instance names and addresses are stated, and it will have been observed that all these miracles occurred in, or close to, Hippo, and in his own diocese. It is very certain that in every case the fact of the miracle is asserted in the most direct and positive terms. There can be no mistake either as to the meaning or intention of the narrative, and there is no symptom whatever of a thought on the part of Augustine to avoid the responsibility of his statements, or to give them as mere vague report. If we compare these accounts with those of the Gospels, we do not find them deficient in any essential detail common to the latter. There is in the Synoptic Gospels only one case in which Jesus is said to have raised the dead. The raising of Jairus' daughter[1] has long been abandoned, as a case of restoration to life, by all critics and theologians, except the few who still persist in ignoring the distinct and positive declaration of Jesus, "The damsel is not dead, but sleepeth." The only case, therefore, in the Synoptics is the account in the third Gospel of the raising of the widow's son,[2] of which, strange to say, the other Gospels know nothing. Now, although, as might have been expected, this narrative is much more highly coloured and picturesque, the difference is chiefly literary, and, indeed, there are really fewer important details given than in the account by Augustine, for instance, of the restoration to life of the daughter of Bassus the Syrian, which took place at Hippo, of which he was bishop, and where he actually resided. Augustine's object in giving his list of miracles did not require him to write picturesque narratives. He merely desired to state bare facts, whilst the authors of the Gospels composed the Life of their Master, in which interesting details were everything. For many reasons we refrain here from alluding to the artistic narrative of the raising of Lazarus, the greatest miracle ascribed to Jesus, which is nevertheless unknown to the other three Evangelists, who, so readily repeating the accounts of trifling cures, would most certainly not have omitted this wonderful event had they ever heard of it.

A complaint is made of the absence of verification and proof of actual death in these cases, or that they were more than mere suspension of the vital powers. We cordially agree in the desire for such evidence, not only in these, but in all miracles. We would ask, however, what verification of the death have we in the case of the widow's son which we have not here? If we apply

[1] Matt. ix. 18, 19, 23–26; Mark v. 22, 24, 35–43; Luke viii. 41, 42, 49–56.
[2] Luke vii. 11–16.

such a test to the miracles of the Gospels, we must reject them as certainly as those of St. Augustine. In neither case have we more than a mere statement that the subjects of these miracles were dead or diseased. So far are we from having any competent medical evidence of the reality of the death, or of the disease, or of the permanence of the supposed cures in the Gospels, that we have little more than the barest reports of these miracles by writers who, even if their identity were established, were not, and do not pretend to have been, eye-witnesses of the occurrences which they relate. Take, for instance, this very raising of the widow's son in the third Gospel, which is unknown to the other Evangelists, and the narrative of which is given only in a Gospel which is not attributed to a personal follower of Jesus.

Now we turn to the second statement: "That with the preface which Augustine prefixes to his list he cannot be said even to profess to guarantee the truth or accuracy of the different instances contained in it." We shall as briefly as possible state what is actually the "preface" of St. Augustine to his list of miracles, and his avowed object for giving it. In the preceding chapter Augustine has been arguing that the world believed in Christ by virtue of divine influence, and not by human persuasion. He contends that it is ridiculous to speak of the false divinity of Romulus when Christians speak of Christ. If, in the time of Romulus, some 600 years before Cicero, people were so enlightened that they refused to believe anything of which they had not experience, how much more, in the still more enlightened days of Cicero himself, and notably in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, would they have rejected belief in the resurrection and ascension of Christ, if divine truth and the testimony of miracles had not proved not only that such things could take place, but that they had actually done so. When the evidence of prophecy joined with that of miracles, and showed that the new doctrines were only contrary to experience and not contrary to reason, the world embraced the faith.[1] "Why, then, say they, do these miracles, which you declare to have taken place formerly, not occur nowadays?" Augustine, in replying, adopts a common rhetorical device. "I might, indeed, answer," he says, "that miracles were necessary before the world believed, in order that the world might believe. Anyone who now requires miracles in order that he may believe is himself a great miracle in not believing what all the world believes. But, really, they say this in order that even those miracles should not be believed either." And he reduces what he considers to be the position of the world in regard to miracles and to the supernatural dogmas of Christianity

[1] *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 7.

to the following dilemma: "Either things incredible which nevertheless occurred and were seen, led to belief in something else incredible which was not seen; or that thing was in itself so credible that no miracles were required to establish it, and so much more is the unbelief of those who deny confuted. This might I say to these most frivolous objectors." He then proceeds to affirm that it cannot be denied that many miracles attest the great miracle of the ascension in the flesh of the risen Christ, and he points out that the actual occurrence of all these things is not only recorded in the most truthful books, but the reasons also given why they took place. These things have become known that they might create belief; these things by the belief they have created have become much more clearly known. They are read to the people, indeed, that they may believe; yet, nevertheless, they would not be read to the people if they had not been believed. After thus stating the answer which he might give, Augustine now returns to answer the question directly. "But, furthermore," he continues, "miracles are performed now in his name, either by means of his sacraments or by the prayers or relics of his saints, but they are not brought under the same strong light as caused the former to be noised abroad with so much glory; inasmuch as the canon of sacred scriptures, which must be definite, causes those miracles to be everywhere publicly read, and become firmly fixed in the memory of all peoples; but these are scarcely known to the whole of a city itself in which they are performed, or to its neighbourhood. Indeed, for the most part, even there very few know of them, and the rest are ignorant, more especially if the city be large; and when they are related elsewhere and to others, the authority does not so commend them as to make them be believed without difficulty or doubt, albeit they are reported by faithful Christians to the faithful." He illustrates this by pointing out that the miracle in Milan by the bodies of the two martyrs, which took place when he himself was there, might reach the knowledge of many because the city is large, and the Emperor and an immense crowd of people witnessed it; but who knows of the miracle performed at Carthage upon his friend Innocent, when he was there also, and saw it with his own eyes? Who knows of the miraculous cure of cancer, he continues, in a lady of rank in the same city? at the silence regarding which he is so indignant. Who knows of the next case he mentions in his list? the cure of a medical man of the same town, to which he adds: "We, nevertheless, do know it, and a few brethren to whose knowledge it may have come."[1] Who, out of Curubus, besides the very few who may have heard of it, knows of the miraculous

[1] *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8.

cure of the paralytic man, whose case Augustine personally investigated? And so on. Observe that there is merely a question of the comparative notoriety of the Gospel miracles and those of his own time, not a doubt as to the reality of the latter. Again, towards the end of his long list, immediately after the narrative of the restoration to life of the child of Eleusinus, which we have quoted, Augustine says: "What can I do? The promise of the completion of this work is pressing, so that I cannot here recount all [the miracles] that I know; and without doubt many of our brethren, when they read this work, will be grieved that I have omitted so very much, which they know as well as I do. This, even now, I beg that they will pardon, and consider how long would be the task of doing that which, for the completion of the work, it is thought necessary not to do. For if I desired to record merely the miracles of healing, without speaking of others, which have been performed by this martyr—that is to say, the most glorious Stephen—in the district of Calama and in ours of Hippo, many volumes must be composed; yet will it not be possible to make a complete collection of them, but only of such as have been published for public reading. For that was our object, since we saw repeated in our time signs of divine power similar to those of old, deeming that they ought not to be lost to the knowledge of the multitude. Now, this relic has not yet been two years at Hippo-Regius, and accounts of many of the miracles performed by it have not been written, as is most certainly known to us; yet the number of those which have been published up to the time this is written amounts to about seventy. At Calama, however, where these relics have been longer, and more of the miracles were recorded, they incomparably exceed this number."[1] Augustine goes on to say that, to his knowledge, many very remarkable miracles were performed by the relics of the same martyr also at Uzali, a district near to Utica, and of one of these, which had recently taken place when he himself was there, he gives an account. Then, before closing his list with the narrative of a miracle which took place at Hippo, in his own church, in his own presence, and in the sight of the whole congregation, he resumes his reply to the opening question. "Many miracles, therefore," he says, "are also performed now; the same God who worked those of which we read performing these by whom he wills, and as he wills; but these miracles neither become similarly known, nor, that they may not slip out of mind, are they stamped, as it were like gravel, into memory, by frequent reading. For even in places where care is taken, as is now the case among us, that accounts of those who receive benefit should be publicly

[1] *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8.

read, those who are present hear them only once, and many are not present at all, so that those who were present do not, after a few days, remember what they heard, and scarcely a single person is met with who repeats what he has heard to one whom he may have known to have been absent."[1]

We shall not attempt any further detailed reference to the myriads of miracles with which the annals of the Church teem up to very recent times. The fact is too well known to require evidence. The saints in the calendar are legion. It has been computed that the number of those whose lives are given in the Bollandist Collection[2] amounts to upwards of 25,000, although, the saints being arranged according to the Calendar, the unfinished work only reaches the 24th of October. When it is considered that all those upon whom the honour of canonisation is conferred have worked miracles, many of them, indeed, almost daily performing such wonders, some idea may be formed of the number of miracles which have occurred in unbroken succession from Apostolic days, and have been believed and recognised by the Church. Vast numbers of these miracles are in all respects similar to those narrated in the Gospels, and they comprise hundreds of cases of restoration of the dead to life. If it be necessary to point out instances in comparatively recent times, we may mention the miracles of this kind liberally ascribed to St. Francis of Assisi, in the thirteenth century, and to his namesake St. Francis Xavier in the sixteenth, although we might refer to much more recent miracles authenticated by the Church. At the present day such phenomena have almost disappeared, and, indeed, with the exception of an occasional winking picture, periodical liquefaction of blood, or apparition of the Virgin, confined to the still ignorant and benighted corners of the earth, miracles are extinct.

[1] *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8.

[2] *Acta Sanctorum quotquot toto orbe coluntur; collegit*, etc., Johannes Bollandus, *cum contin.* Henschenii, 54 vol. fol. *Venetiis*, 1734-1861.

CHAPTER VI.

MIRACLES IN RELATION TO IGNORANCE AND SUPERSTITION

We have maintained that the miracles reported after apostolic days are precisely of the same types in all material points as the earlier miracles. Setting aside miracles of a trivial and unworthy character, there remain a countless number cast in the same mould as those of the Gospels—miraculous cure of diseases, expulsion of demons, transformation of elements, supernatural nourishment, resurrection of dead—of many of which we have quoted instances. A natural objection is anticipated by Dr. Mozley: "It will be urged, perhaps, that a large portion even of the Gospel miracles are of the class here mentioned as ambiguous—cures, visions, expulsions of evil spirits; but this observation does not affect the character of the Gospel miracles as a body, because we judge of the body or whole from its highest specimen, not from its lowest." He takes his stand upon, "*e.g.*, our Lord's Resurrection and Ascension."[1] Now, without discussing the principle laid down here, it is evident that the great distinction between the Gospel and other miracles is thus narrowed to a very small compass. It is admitted that the mass of the Gospel miracles are of a class characterised as ambiguous, because "the current miracles of human history" are also chiefly of the same type, and the distinctive character is derived avowedly only from a few high specimens such as the Resurrection. We have already referred to the fact that in the Synoptic Gospels there is only one case, reported by the third Gospel alone, in which Jesus is said to have raised the dead. St. Augustine alone, however, chronicles several cases in which life was restored to the dead. Post-apostolic miracles, therefore, are far from lacking this ennobling type. Observe that there is not here so much a discussion of the reality of the subsequent miracles of the Church as a contrast drawn between them and other reputed miracles and those of the Gospel; but from this point of view it is impossible to maintain that the Gospels have a monopoly of the highest class of miracles. Such miracles are met with long before the dawn of Christianity, and continued to occur long after apostolic times.

Much stress is laid upon the form of the Gospel miracles; but,

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, p. 214.

as we have already shown, it is the actual resurrection of the dead, for instance, which is the miracle, and this is not affected by the more or less dramatic manner in which it is said to have been effected, or in which the narrative of the event is composed. Literary skill and the judicious management of details may make or mar the form of any miracle. The narrative of the restoration of the dead child to life by Elisha might have been more impressive had the writer omitted the circumstance that the child sneezed seven times before opening his eyes, and the miracle would probably have been considered greater had the prophet merely said to the child, "Arise!" instead of stretching himself on the body; but, setting aside human cravings for the picturesque and artistic, the essence of the miracle would have remained the same. There is one point, however, regarding which it may be well to make a few remarks. Whilst a vast number of miracles are ascribed to direct personal action of saints, many more are attributed to their relics. Now, this is no exclusive characteristic of later miracles, but Christianity itself shares it with still earlier times. The case in which a dead body which touched the bones of Elisha was restored to life will occur to everyone. "And it came to pass, as they were burying a man, that, behold, they spied a band of Moabites; and they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha: and when the man was let down and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived, and stood up on his feet."[1] The mantle of Elijah smiting asunder the waters before Elisha may be cited as another instance.[2] The woman who touches the hem of the garment of Jesus in the crowd is made whole,[3] and all the sick and "possessed" of the country are represented as being healed by touching Jesus, or even the mere hem of his garment.[4] It was supposed that the shadow of Peter falling on the sick as he passed had a curative effect,[5] and it is very positively stated: "And God wrought miracles of no common kind by the hands of Paul; so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them."[6]

The argument which assumes an enormous distinction between Gospel and other miracles betrays the prevalent scepticism, even in the Church, of all miracles except those which it is considered an article of faith to maintain. If we inquire how those think who are more logical and thorough in their belief in the supernatural, we find the distinction denied. "The

[1] 2 Kings xiii. 21.

[2] 2 Kings ii. 14, cf. 8. In raising the dead child, Elisha sends his staff to be laid on the child.

[3] Mark v. 27 ff.; cf. Luke viii. 44 ff.; Matt. ix. 20 ff.

[4] Matt. xiv. 36; cf. Luke vi. 19; Mark iii. 10.

[5] Acts v. 15.

[6] *Ib.*, xix. 11, 12.

question," says Newman, "has hitherto been argued on the admission that a distinct line can be drawn in point of character and circumstances between the miracles of Scripture and those of Church history; but this is by no means the case. It is true, indeed, that the miracles of Scripture, viewed as a whole, recommend themselves to our reason, and claim our veneration beyond all others, by a peculiar dignity and beauty; but still it is only as a whole that they make this impression upon us. Some of them, on the contrary, fall short of the attributes which attach to them in general; nay, are inferior in these respects to certain ecclesiastical miracles, and are received only on the credit of the system of which they form part. Again, specimens are not wanting in the history of the Church, of miracles as awful in their character, and as momentous in their effects, as those which are recorded in Scripture."[1] Now here is one able and thorough supporter of miracles denying the enormous distinction between those of the Gospel and those of human history, which another admits to be essential to the former as evidence of a revelation.

Such a difficulty, however, is met by asserting that there would be no disadvantage to the Gospel miracles, and no doubt regarding them involved, if for some later miracles there was evidence as strong as for those of the Gospel. "All the result would be, that we should admit these miracles over and above the Gospel ones."[2] The equality of the evidence, however, is denied, in any case. "Between the evidence, then, upon which the Gospel miracles stand, and that for later miracles, we see a broad distinction arising, not to mention again the nature and type of the Gospel miracles themselves—from the contemporaneous date of the testimony to them, the character of the witnesses, the probation of the testimony; especially when we contrast with these points the false doctrine and audacious fraud which rose up in later ages, and in connection with which so large a portion of the later miracles of Christianity made their appearance."[3] We consider the point touching the type of the Gospel miracles disposed of, and we may, therefore, confine ourselves to the rest of this argument. If we look for any external evidence of the miracles of Jesus in some marked effect produced by them at the time they are said to have occurred, we find anything but confirmation of the statements of the Gospels. It is a notorious fact that, in spite of these miracles, very few of the Jews amongst whom they were performed believed in Jesus, and that Christianity made its chief converts not where the supposed miracles took place, but where an account of them was alone given by

[1] J. H. Newman, *Two Essays on Miracles*, p. 160 f.
[2] Mozley, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 231. [3] *Ib.*, p. 220 f.

enthusiastic missionaries. Such astounding exhibitions of power as raising the dead, giving sight to the blind, walking on the sea, changing water into wine, and indefinitely multiplying a few loaves and fishes, not only did not make any impression on the Jews themselves, but were never heard of out of Palestine until long after the events are said to have occurred, when the narrative of them was slowly disseminated by Christian teachers and writers.

Dr. Mozley refers to the contemporary testimony "for certain great and cardinal Gospel miracles which, if granted, clears away all antecedent objection to the reception of the rest," and he says: "That the first promulgators of Christianity asserted as a fact which had come under the cognizance of their senses the Resurrection of our Lord from the dead is as certain as anything in history."[1] What they really did assert, so far from being certain, must, as we shall hereafter see, be considered matter of the greatest doubt. But if the general statement be taken that the Resurrection, for instance, was promulgated as a fact which the early preachers of Christianity themselves believed to have taken place, the evidence does not in that case present the broad distinction he asserts. The miracles recounted by St. Athanasius and St. Augustine, for example, were likewise proclaimed with equal clearness, and even greater promptitude and publicity, at the very spot where many of them were said to have been performed, and the details were much more immediately reduced to writing. The mere assertion in neither case goes for much as evidence, but the fact is that we have absolutely no contemporaneous testimony as to what the first promulgators of Christianity actually asserted, or as to the real grounds upon which they made such assertions. We shall presently enter upon a thorough examination of the testimony for the Gospel narratives, their authorship and authenticity; but we may here be permitted so far to anticipate as to remark that, applied to documentary evidence, any reasoning from the contemporaneous date of the testimony, and the character of the witnesses, is contradicted by the whole history of New Testament literature. Whilst the most uncritically zealous assertors of the antiquity of the Gospels never venture to date the earliest of them within a quarter of a century from the death of Jesus, every tyro is aware that there is not a particle of evidence of the existence of our Gospels until very long after that interval—hereafter we shall show how long—that two of our Synoptic Gospels, at least, were not composed in their present form by the writers to whom they are attributed; that there is, indeed, nothing worthy of the name of evidence that any one of

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, p. 219.

these Gospels was written by the person whose name it bears; that the second Gospel is attributed to one who was not an eye-witness, and of whose identity there is the greatest doubt, even amongst those who assert the authorship of Mark; that the third Gospel is an avowed later compilation,[1] and likewise ascribed to one who was not a follower of Jesus himself; and that the authorship of the fourth Gospel and its historical character are amongst the most unsettled questions of criticism, not to use here any more definite terms. This being the state of the case, it is absurd to lay such emphasis on the contemporaneous date of the testimony, and on the character of the witnesses, since it has not even been determined who those witnesses are, and two even of the supposed evangelists were not personal eye-witnesses at all.[2] Surely the testimony of Athanasius regarding the miracles of St. Anthony, and that of Augustine regarding his list of miracles occurring in, or close to, his own diocese within two years of the time at which he writes, or, to refer to more recent times, the evidence of Pascal for the Port-Royal miracles, it must be admitted, not only does not present the broad distinction of evidence asserted, but, on the contrary, is even more unassailable than that of the Gospel miracles. The Church, which is the authority for those miracles, is also the authority for the long succession of such works wrought by the saints. The identity of the writers we have instanced has never been doubted; their trustworthiness in so far as stating what they believe to be true is concerned has never been impugned; the same could be affirmed of writers in every age who record such miracles. The fact is that theologians demand evidence for later miracles which they have not for those of the Gospels, and which transmitted reverence forbids their requiring. They strain out a gnat and swallow a camel.

The life of sacrifice and suffering of the Apostles is pointed out as a remarkable and peculiar testimony to the truth of the Gospel miracles, and notably of the Resurrection and Ascension. Without examining, here, how much we really know of those lives and sufferings, one thing is perfectly evident: that sacrifice, suffering, and martyrdom itself are evidence of nothing except of the personal belief of the person enduring them; they do not prove the truth of the doctrines believed. No one doubts the high religious enthusiasm of the early Christians, or the earnest and fanatical zeal with which they courted martyrdom; but this is no

[1] Luke i. 1–4.

[2] We need scarcely point out that Paul, to whom so many of the writings of the New Testament are ascribed, and who practically is the author of ecclesiastical Christianity, not only was not an eye-witness of the Gospel miracles, but never even saw Jesus.

exclusive characteristic of Christianity. Every religion has had its martyrs, every error its devoted victims. Does the marvellous endurance of the Hindoo, whose limbs wither after years of painful persistence in vows to his Deity, prove the truth of Brahmanism? or do the fanatical believers who cast themselves under the wheels of the car of Jagganath establish the soundness of their creed? Do the Jews, who for centuries bore the fiercest contumely of the world, and were persecuted, hunted, and done to death by every conceivable torture for persisting in their denial of the truth of the Incarnation, Resurrection, and Ascension, and in their rejection of Jesus Christ—do they thus furnish a convincing argument for the truth of their belief and the falsity of Christianity? Or have the thousands who have been consigned to the stake by the Christian Church herself, for persisting in asserting what she has denounced as damnable heresy, proved the correctness of their views by their sufferings and death? History is full of the records of men who have honestly believed every kind of error and heresy, and have been steadfast to the death, through persecution and torture, in their mistaken belief. There is nothing so inflexible as superstitious fanaticism, and persecution, instead of extinguishing it, has invariably been the most certain means of its propagation. The sufferings of the Apostles, therefore, cannot prove anything beyond their own belief, and the question, what it was they really did believe and suffer for, is by no means so simple as it appears.

Now the long succession of ecclesiastical and other miracles has an important bearing upon those of the New Testament, whether we believe or deny their reality. If we regard the miracles of Church history to be in the main real, the whole force of the Gospel miracles, as exceptional supernatural evidence of a Divine Revelation, is annihilated. The "miraculous credentials of Christianity" assume a very different aspect when they are considered from such a point of view. Admitted to be scarcely recognisable from miracles wrought by Satanic agency, they are seen to be a continuation of wonders recorded in the Old Testament, to be preceded and accompanied by pretension to similar power on the part of the Jews and other nations, and to be succeeded by cycles of miracles, in all essential respects the same, performed subsequently for upwards of fifteen hundred years. Supernatural evidence of so common and prodigal a nature certainly betrays a great want of force and divine speciality. How could that be considered as express evidence for a new Divine revelation which was already so well known to the world, and which is scattered broadcast over so many centuries, as well as successfully simulated by Satan?

If, on the other hand, we dismiss the miracles of later ages as

false, and as merely the creations of superstition or pious imagination, how can the miracles of the Gospel, which are precisely the same in type, and not better established as facts, remain unshaken? The Apostles and Evangelists were men of like passions, and also of like superstitions, with others of their time, and must be measured by the same standard.

If we consider the particular part which miracles have played in human history, we find precisely the phenomena which might have been expected if, instead of being considered as real occurrences, they are recognised as the mistakes or creations of ignorance and superstition during that period in which "reality melted into fable, and invention unconsciously trespassed on the province of history." Their occurrence is limited to ages which were totally ignorant of physical laws, and they have been numerous or rare precisely in proportion to the degree of imagination and love of the marvellous characterising the people amongst whom they are said to have occurred. Instead of a few evidential miracles taking place at one epoch of history, and filling the world with surprise at such novel and exceptional phenomena, we find miracles represented as occurring in all ages and in all countries. The Gospel miracles are set in the midst of a series of similar wonders, which commenced many centuries before the dawn of Christianity and continued, without interruption, for fifteen hundred years after it. They did not in the most remote degree originate the belief in miracles, or give the first suggestion of spurious imitation. It may, on the contrary, be much more truly said that the already existing belief created these miracles. No divine originality characterised the evidence selected to accredit the Divine Revelation. The miracles with which the history of the world is full occurred in ages of darkness and superstition, and they gradually ceased when enlightenment became more generally diffused. At the very time when knowledge of the laws of nature began to render men capable of judging of the reality of miracles, these wonders entirely failed. This extraordinary cessation of miracles, precisely at the time when their evidence might have acquired value by an appeal to persons capable of appreciating them, is perfectly unintelligible if they be viewed as the supernatural credentials of a Divine revelation. If, on the other hand, they be regarded as the mistakes of imaginative excitement and ignorance, nothing is more natural than their extinction at the time when the superstition which created them gave place to knowledge.

As a historical fact, there is nothing more certain than that miracles, and the belief in them, disappeared exactly when education and knowledge of the operation of natural laws became

diffused throughout Europe, and that the last traces of belief in supernatural interference with the order of nature are only to be found in localities where ignorance and superstition still prevail, and render delusion or pious fraud of that description possible. Miracles are now denied to places more enlightened than Naples or La Salette. The inevitable inference from this fact is fatal to the mass of miracles, and it is not possible to protect them from it. Miracle cures by the relics of saints, upheld for fifteen centuries by all the power of the Church, utterly failed when medical science, increasing in spite of persecution, demonstrated the natural action of physiological laws. The theory of the demoniacal origin of disease has been entirely and for ever dispelled, and the host of miracles in connection with it retrospectively exploded by the progress of science. Witchcraft and sorcery, the belief in which reigned supreme for so many centuries, are known to have been nothing but the delusions of ignorant superstition.

Notwithstanding the facts which we have stated, it has been argued: "Christianity is the religion of the civilised world, and it is believed upon its miraculous evidence. Now, for a set of miracles to be accepted in a rude age, and to retain their authority throughout a succession of such ages, and over the ignorant and superstitious part of mankind, may be no such great result for the miracle to accomplish, because it is easy to satisfy those who do not inquire. But this is not the state of the case which we have to meet on the subject of the Christian miracles. The Christian being the most intelligent, the civilised portion of the world, these miracles are accepted by the Christian body as a whole, by the thinking and educated, as well as the uneducated, part of it, and the Gospel is believed upon that evidence."[1] The picture of Christendom here suggested is purely imaginary. We are asked to believe that succeeding generations of thinking and educated, as well as uneducated, men since the commencement of the period in which the adequate inquiry into the reality of miracles became possible, have made that adequate inquiry, and have intelligently and individually accepted miracles and believed the Gospel in consequence of their attestation. The fact, however, is that Christianity became the religion of Europe before men either possessed the knowledge requisite to appreciate the difficulties involved in the acceptance of miracles, or minds sufficiently freed from ignorant superstition to question the reality of the supposed supernatural interference with the order of nature, and belief had become so much a matter of habit that, in our time, the great majority of men have professed belief for no better reason

[1] Mozley, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 27.

than that their fathers believed before them. Belief is now little more than a transmitted quality or hereditary custom. Few men, even now, have either the knowledge or the leisure requisite to enable them to enter upon such an examination of miracles as can entitle them to affirm that they intelligently accept miracles for themselves. We have shown, moreover, that so loose are the ideas even of the clergy upon the subject that dignitaries of the Church fail to see either the evidential purpose of miracles or the need for evidence at all, and the first intelligent step towards inquiry—doubt—has generally been stigmatised almost as a crime.

So far from the statement which we are considering being correct, it is notorious that the great mass of those who are competent to examine, and who have done so, altogether reject miracles. Instead of the "thinking and educated" men of science accepting miracles, they, as a body, distinctly deny them, and hence the antagonism between science and ecclesiastical Christianity; and it is surely not necessary to point out how many of the profoundest critics and scholars of Germany, and of all other countries in Europe, who have turned their attention to Biblical subjects, have long ago rejected the miraculous elements of the Christian religion.

It is necessary that we should now refer to the circumstance that all the arguments which we have hitherto considered in support of miracles, whether to explain or account for them, have proceeded upon an assumption of the reality of the alleged phenomena. Had it been first requisite to establish the truth of facts of such an astounding nature, the necessity of accounting for them would never have arisen. It is clear, therefore, that an assumption which permits the argument to attain any such position begs almost the whole question. Facts, however astounding, the actual occurrence of which had been proved, would claim a latitude of explanation, which a mere narrative of those alleged facts, written by an unknown person some eighteen centuries ago, could not obtain. If, for instance, it be once established as an absolute fact that a man actually dead, and some days buried, upon whose body decomposition had already made some progress,[1] had been restored to life, the fact of his death and of his subsequent resuscitation being so absolutely proved that the possibility of deception or of mistake on the part of the witnesses was totally excluded, it is clear that an argument, as to whether such an occurrence should be ascribed to known or unknown laws, would assume a very different character from that which it would have borne if the argument merely sought to account for so

[1] Cf. John xi. 39.

astounding a phenomenon of whose actual occurrence there was no sufficient evidence.

It must not be forgotten, therefore, that, as the late Professor Baden Powell pointed out, "At the present day it is not *a miracle*, but the *narrative of a miracle*, to which any argument can refer, or to which faith is accorded."[1] The discussion of miracles, then, is not one regarding miracles actually performed within our own knowledge, but merely regarding miracles said to have been performed eighteen hundred years ago, the reality of which was not verified at the time by any scientific examination, and whose occurrence is merely reported in the Gospels. Now, although Paley and others rightly and logically maintain that Christianity requires, and should be believed only upon, its miraculous evidence, the fact is that popular Christianity is not believed because of miracles, but miracles are accepted because they are related in the Gospels which are supposed to contain the doctrines of Christianity. The Gospels have for many generations been given to the child as inspired records, and doubt of miracles has, therefore, either never arisen or has been instantly suppressed, simply because miracles are recorded in the sacred volume. It could scarcely be otherwise, for in point of fact the Gospel miracles stand upon no other testimony. We are therefore in this position: We are asked to believe astounding announcements beyond the limits of human reason, which we could only be justified in believing upon miraculous evidence, upon the testimony of miracles which are only reported by the records which also alone convey the announcements which those miracles were intended to accredit. There is no other contemporary evidence whatever. The importance of the Gospels, therefore, as the almost solitary testimony to the occurrence of miracles can scarcely be exaggerated. We have already made an anticipatory remark regarding the nature of these documents, to which we may add that they are not the work of perfectly independent historians, but of men who were engaged in disseminating the new doctrines, and in saying this we have no intention of accusing the writers of conscious deception; it is, however, necessary to state the fact in order that the value of the testimony may be fairly estimated. The narratives of miracles were written by ardent partisans, with minds inflamed by religious zeal and enthusiasm, in an age of ignorance and superstition, a considerable time after the supposed miraculous occurrences had taken place. All history shows how rapidly pious memory exaggerates and idealises the traditions of the past, and simple actions might readily be transformed into miracles, as the narratives circulated, in a period so prone to

[1] *Order of Nature*, p. 285.

superstition and so characterised by love of the marvellous. Religious excitement could not, under such circumstances and in such an age, have escaped this exaggeration. How few men in more enlightened times have been able soberly to appreciate, and accurately to record, exciting experiences, where feeling and religious emotion have been concerned. Prosaic accuracy of observation and of language, at all times rare, are the last qualities we could expect to find in the early ages of Christianity. In the certain fact that disputes arose among the Apostles themselves so shortly after the death of their great Master, we have one proof that even amongst them there was no accurate appreciation of the teaching of Jesus,[1] and the frequent instances of their misunderstanding of very simple matters, and of their want of enlightenment, which occur throughout the Gospels are certainly not calculated to inspire much confidence in their intelligence and accuracy of observation.

Now it is apparent that the evidence for miracles requires to embrace two distinct points: the reality of the alleged facts, and the accuracy of the inference that the phenomena were produced by supernatural agency. The task would even then remain of demonstrating the particular supernatural Being by whom the miracles were performed, which is admitted to be impossible. We have hitherto chiefly confined ourselves to a consideration of the antecedent credibility of such events, and of the fitness of those who are supposed to have witnessed them to draw accurate inferences from the alleged phenomena. Those who have formed any adequate conception of the amount of testimony which would be requisite in order to establish the reality of occurrences in violation of an order of nature, which is based upon universal and invariable experience, must recognise that, even if the earliest asserted origin of our four Gospels could be established upon the most irrefragable grounds, the testimony of the writers—men of like ignorance with their contemporaries, men of like passions with ourselves—would be utterly incompetent to prove the reality of miracles. We have already sufficiently discussed this point, more especially in connection with Hume's argument, and need not here resume it. Every consideration, historical and philosophical, has hitherto discredited the whole theory of miracles, and further inquiry might be abandoned as unnecessary. In order, however, to render our conclusion complete, it remains for us to see whether, as affirmed, there be any special evidence regarding the alleged facts entitling the Gospel miracles to exceptional attention. If, instead of being clear and direct, the undoubted testimony of known eye-witnesses free from superstition,

[1] *E.g.*, Gal. ii. 11 ff.

and capable, through adequate knowledge, rightly to estimate the alleged phenomena, we find that the actual accounts have none of these qualifications, the final decision with regard to miracles and the reality of Divine revelation will be easy and conclusive.

PART II.

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

INTRODUCTION

Before commencing our examination of the evidence as to the date, authorship, and character of the Gospels, it may be well to make a few preliminary remarks, and clearly state certain canons of criticism. We shall make no attempt to establish any theory as to the date at which any of the Gospels was actually written, but simply examine all the testimony which is extant, with the view of ascertaining what is known of these works and their authors, certainly and distinctly, as distinguished from what is merely conjectured or inferred. Modern opinion in an Inquiry like ours must not be taken for ancient evidence. We propose, therefore, as exhaustively as possible to search all the writings of the early Church for information regarding the Gospels, and to examine even the alleged indications of their use.

It is very important, however, that the silence of early writers should receive as much attention as any supposed allusions to the Gospels. When such writers, quoting largely from the Old Testament and other sources, deal with subjects which would naturally be assisted by reference to our Gospels, and still more so by quoting such works as authoritative; and yet we find that not only they do not show any knowledge of those Gospels, but actually quote passages from unknown sources, or sayings of Jesus derived from tradition; the inference must be that our Gospels were either unknown or not recognised as works of authority at the time.

It is still more important that we should constantly bear in mind that a great number of Gospels existed in the early Church which are no longer extant, and of most of which even the names are lost. We need not here do more than refer, in corroboration of this remark, to the preliminary statement of the author of the third Gospel: "Forasmuch as many (πολλοὶ) took in hand to set forth in order a declaration of the things which have been accomplished

among us," etc.[1] It is, therefore, evident that before our third Synoptic was written many similar works were already in circulation. Looking at the close similarity of large portions of the three Synoptics, it is almost certain that many of the writings here mentioned bore a close analogy to each other and to our Gospels, and this is known to have been the case, for instance, amongst the various forms of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews." When, therefore, in early writings we meet with quotations closely resembling, or, we may add, even identical with, passages which are found in our Gospels, the source of which, however, is not mentioned, nor is any author's name indicated, the similarity, or even identity, cannot by any means be admitted as proof that the quotation is necessarily from our Gospels, and not from some other similar work now no longer extant, and more especially not when, in the same writings, there are other quotations from sources different from our Gospels. Whether regarded as historical records or as writings embodying the mere tradition of the early Christians, our Gospels cannot be recognised as the exclusive depositories of the genuine sayings and doings of Jesus. So far from the common possession by many works in early times of sayings of Jesus in closely similar form being either strange or improbable, the really remarkable phenomenon is that such material variation in the report of the more important historical teaching should exist amongst them. But whilst similarity to our Gospels in passages quoted by early writers from unknown sources cannot prove the use of our Gospels, variation from them would suggest or prove a different origin, and, at least, it is obvious that anonymous quotations which do not agree with our Gospels cannot, in any case, necessarily indicate their existence. It may be well, before proceeding further, to illustrate and justify the canons of criticism which we have laid down by examples in our three Synoptics themselves.

Let us for a moment suppose the "Gospel according to Luke" to have been lost like the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," and so many others. In the works of one of the Fathers we discover the following quotation from an unnamed evangelical work: "And he said unto them (ἔλεγεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς): The harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that he would send forth labourers into his harvest. Go your ways: (ὑπάγετε) behold I send you forth as lambs (ἄρνας) in the midst of wolves." Apologetic critics would probably maintain that this was a compilation from memory of passages quoted freely from our first Gospel, that is to say Matt. ix. 37: "Then saith he unto his disciples (τότε λέγει

[1] Luke i. 1.

τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ) the harvest," etc., and Matt. x. 16: "Behold I (ἐγὼ) send you forth as sheep (πρόβατα) in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore," etc., which, with the differences which we have indicated, agree. It would probably be in vain to argue that the quotation indicated a continuous order, and the variations combined to confirm the probability of a different source; and still more so to point out that, although parts of the quotation separated from their context might, to a certain extent, correspond with scattered verses in the first Gospel, such a circumstance was no proof that the quotation was taken from that and from no other Gospel. The passage, however, is a literal quotation from Luke x. 2, 3, which, as we have assumed, had been lost.

Again, still supposing the third Gospel no longer extant, we might find the following quotation in a work of the Fathers: "Take heed to yourselves (ἑαυτοῖς) of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy (ἥτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις). For there is nothing covered up (συγκεκαλυμμένον) which shall not be revealed, and hid which shall not be known." It would, of course, be affirmed that this was evidently a combination of two verses of our first Gospel, quoted almost literally, with merely a few very immaterial slips of memory in the parts we note, and the explanatory words "which is hypocrisy" introduced by the Father, and not a part of the quotation at all. The two verses are Matt. xvi. 6: "Beware and (ὁρᾶτε καὶ) take heed of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (καὶ Σαδδουκαίων), and Matt. x. 26....."For (γάρ) there is nothing covered (κεκαλυμμένον) that shall not be revealed, and hid that shall not be known." It would probably be argued that the sentence should be divided, and each part would then have its parallel in separate portions of the Gospel. That such a system is mistaken is clearly established by the fact that the quotation, instead of being such a combination, is simply taken as it stands from the Gospel according to Luke xii. 1, 2.

To give another example, and such might easily be multiplied, if our second Gospel had been lost and the following passage were met with in one of the Fathers without its source being indicated, what would be the argument of those who insist that quotations, though differing from our Gospels, were yet taken from them? "If any one have (εἴ τις ἔχει) ears to hear, let him hear. And he said unto them: Take heed what (τί) ye hear; with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you: and more shall be given unto you. For he (ὃς) that hath to him shall be given, and he (καὶ ὃς) that hath not from him shall be taken even that which he hath." Upon the principle on which patristic quotations are treated, it would probably be positively affirmed that this passage was a quotation from our first and third Gospels

combined and made from memory. The exigencies of the occasion might probably lead to the assertion that the words, "And he said to them," really indicated a separation of the latter part of the quotation from the preceding, and that the Father thus showed that the passage was not consecutive; and as to the phrase, "and more shall be given unto you," that it was evidently an addition of the Father. The passage would be dissected, and its different members compared with scattered sentences, and declared almost literal quotations from the Canonical Gospels. Matt. xiii. 9: "He that hath (ὁ ἔχων) ears to hear, let him hear."[1] Luke viii. 18: "Take heed, therefore, how (οὖν πῶς) ye hear." Matt. vii. 2: ".....with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you."[2] Matt. xiii. 12: "For whosoever (ὅστις) hath, to him shall be given (and he shall have abundance); but whosoever (ὅστις δὲ) hath not from him shall be taken even that which he hath."[3] In spite of these ingenious assertions, however, the quotation in reality is literally and consecutively taken from Mark iv. 23–25.

These examples may suffice to show that any argument which commences by the assumption that the order of a passage quoted may be entirely disregarded, and that it is sufficient to find parallels scattered irregularly up and down the Gospels to warrant the conclusion that the passage is compiled from them, and is not a consecutive quotation from some other source, is utterly unfounded and untenable. The supposition of a lost Gospel which has just been made to illustrate this argument is, however, not a mere supposition, but a fact; for we no longer have the Gospel according to Peter, nor that according to the Hebrews, not to mention the numerous other works in use in the early Church. The instances we have given show the importance of the order, as well as the language, of quotations, and while they prove the impossibility of demonstrating that a consecutive passage which differs not only in language, but in order, from the parallels in our Gospels must be derived from them, they likewise attest the probability that such passages are actually quoted from a different source.

If we examine further, however, in the same way, quotations which differ merely in language, we arrive at the very same conclusion. Supposing the third Gospel to be lost, what would be the source assigned to the following quotation from an unnamed Gospel in the work of one of the Fathers? "No servant (οἰδεὶς οἰκέτης) can serve two lords, for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." Of course the

[1] Cf. Matt. xi. 15; Luke viii. 8.
[2] Cf. Luke vi. 38.
[3] Cf. Matt. xxv. 29; Luke viii. 18, xix. 26.

passage would be claimed as a quotation from memory of Matt. vi. 24, with which it perfectly corresponds, with the exception of the addition of the second word οἰκέτης, which, it would no doubt be argued, is an evident and very natural amplification of the simple οὐδεὶς of the first Gospel. Yet this passage, only differing by the single word from Matthew, is a literal quotation from the Gospel according to Luke xvi. 13. Or, to take another instance, supposing the third Gospel to be lost, and the following passage quoted, from an unnamed source, by one of the Fathers: "Beware (προσέχετε) of the Scribes which desire to walk in long robes, and love (φιλούντων) greetings in the markets, and chief seats in the synagogues and uppermost places at feasts; which devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive greater damnation." This would, without hesitation, be declared a quotation from memory of Mark xii. 38–40: ".....Beware (βλέπετε) of the Scribes which desire to walk in long robes and greetings in the markets, and chief seats in the synagogues and uppermost places at feasts; which devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive," etc. It is, however, a literal quotation of Luke xx. 46, 47; yet, probably, it would be in vain to submit to apologetic critics that the passage was not derived from Mark, but from a lost Gospel. To quote one more instance, let us suppose the "Gospel according to Mark" no longer extant, and that in some early work there existed the following quotation: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye (τρυμαλιᾶς) of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God." This would, of course, be claimed as a quotation from memory of Matt. xix. 24,[1] with which it agrees, with the exception of the substitution of τρυπήματος for the τρυμαλιᾶς. It would not the less have been an exact quotation from Mark x. 25.[2]

The actual agreement of any saying of Jesus, quoted by one of the early Fathers from an unnamed source, with a passage in our Gospels is by no means conclusive evidence that the quotation was actually derived from that Gospel. It must be apparent that

[1] Cf. Luke xviii. 25.

[2] For further instances compare—

Luke xiv. 11 with Matt. xxiii. 12 and Luke xviii. 14.
,, xvii. 37 ,, ,, xxiv. 28.
,, vi. 41 ,, ,, vii. 3.
Mark vi. 4 ,, ,, xiii. 57.
,, viii. 34 ,, Luke ix. 23.
Matt. xviii. 11 ,, ,, xix. 10.
,, xxiv. 37 ,, ,, xiii. 34.
,, xxiv. 34–36 with Mark xiii. 30–32 and Luke xxi. 32–33.

literal agreement in reporting short and important sayings is not in itself so surprising as to constitute proof that, occurring in two histories, the one must have copied from the other. The only thing which is surprising is that such frequent inaccuracy should exist. When we add, however, the fact that most of the larger early evangelical works, including our Synoptic Gospels, must have been compiled out of the same original sources, and have been largely indebted to each other, the common possession of such sayings becomes a matter of natural occurrence. Moreover, it must be admitted even by apologetic critics that, in a case of such vast importance as the report of sayings of Jesus, upon the verbal accuracy of which the most essential doctrines of Christianity depend, it cannot be a wonder, to the extent of proving plagiarism so to say, if various Gospels report the same saying of Jesus in the same words. Practically the Synoptic Gospels differ in their reports a great deal more than is right or desirable ; but we may take them as an illustration of the fact that identity of passages, where the source is unnamed, by no means proves that such passages in a work of the early Fathers were derived from one Gospel, and not from any other. Let us suppose our first Gospel to have been lost, and the following quotation from an unnamed source to be found in an early work : "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire." This, being in literal agreement with Luke iii. 9, would certainly be declared by modern apologists conclusive proof that the Father was acquainted with that Gospel ; and although the context in the work of the Father might, for instance, be : "Ye shall know them from their works, and every tree," etc., and yet, in the third Gospel, the context is : "And now also, the axe is laid unto the root of the trees : and every tree," etc., that would by no means give them pause. The explanation of combination of texts, and quotation from memory, is sufficiently elastic for every emergency. Now, the words in question might in reality be a quotation from the lost Gospel according to Matthew, in which they twice occur ; so that here is a passage which is literally repeated three times—Matt. iii. 10, vii. 19, and Luke iii. 9. In Matt. iii. 10, and in the third Gospel, the words are part of a saying of John the Baptist ; whilst in Matt. vii. 19 they are given as part of the Sermon on the Mount, with a different context.

Another illustration of this may be given, by supposing the Gospel of Luke to be no longer extant, and the following sentence in one of the Fathers : "And ye shall be hated by all men, for my name's sake." These very words occur both in Matt. x. 22 and Mark xiii. 13, in both of which places there follow the words : "but he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved."

There might here have been a doubt as to whether the Father derived the words from the first or second Gospel, but they would have been ascribed either to the one or to the other, whilst in reality they were taken from a different work altogether—Luke xxi. 17. Here again we have the same words in three Gospels. In how many more of them may not the same passage have been found? One more instance to conclude. The following passage might be quoted from an unnamed source by one of the Fathers: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." If the Gospel according to Mark were no longer extant, this would be claimed as a quotation either from Matt. xxiv. 35 or Luke xxi. 33, in both of which it occurs; but, notwithstanding, the Father might not have been acquainted with either of them, and simply have quoted from Mark xiii. 31.[1] And here again the three Gospels contain the same passage without variation.

Now, in all these cases not only is the selection of the Gospel from which the quotation was actually taken completely an open question, since they all have it, but still more is the point uncertain, when it is considered that many other works may also have contained it, historical sayings being naturally common property. Does the agreement of the quotation with a passage which is equally found in the three Gospels prove the existence of all of them? and if not, how is the Gospel from which it was actually taken to be distinguished? If it be difficult to do so, how much more when the possibility and probability, demonstrated by the agreement of the three extant, that it might have formed part of a dozen other works is taken into account.

It is unnecessary to add that, in proportion as we remove from apostolic times without positive evidence of the existence and authenticity of our Gospels, so does the value of their testimony dwindle away. Indeed, requiring as we do clear, direct, and irrefragable evidence of the integrity, authenticity, and historical character of these Gospels, doubt or obscurity on these points must inevitably be fatal to them as sufficient testimony—if they could, under any circumstances, be considered sufficient testimony—for miracles and a direct Divine revelation like ecclesiastical Christianity.

We propose to examine, first, the evidence for the three Synoptics, and then, separately, the testimony regarding the fourth Gospel.

[1] Cf. Matt. vii. 7-8 with Luke xi. 9-10; Matt. xi. 25 with Luke x. 21.

CHAPTER I.

CLEMENT OF ROME—THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS—THE PASTOR OF HERMAS

THE first work which presents itself for examination is the so-called first Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, which, together with a second Epistle to the same community, likewise attributed to Clement, is preserved to us in the *Codex Alexandrinus*, a MS. assigned by the most competent judges to the second half of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century, in which these Epistles follow the books of the New Testament. The second Epistle, which is evidently not epistolary, but the fragment of a Homily, although it thus shares with the first the honour of a canonical position in one of the most ancient codices of the New Testament, is not mentioned at all by the earlier Fathers who refer to the first ;[1] and Eusebius, who is the first writer who mentions it, expresses doubt regarding it, while Jerome and Photius state that it was rejected by the ancients. It is now universally regarded as spurious, and dated about the end of the second century, or later. We shall hereafter see that many other pseudographs were circulated in the name of Clement, to which, however, we need not further allude at present.

There has been much controversy as to the identity of the Clement to whom the first Epistle is attributed. In early days he was supposed to be the Clement mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians (iv. 3),[2] but this is now generally doubted or denied, and the authenticity of the Epistle has, indeed, been called in question both by earlier and later critics. It is unnecessary to detail the various traditions regarding the supposed writer, but we must point out that the Epistle itself makes no mention of the author's name. It merely purports to be addressed by "The Church of God which sojourns at Rome to the Church of God sojourning at Corinth" ; but in the *Codex Alexandrinus* the title of "The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians" is added at

[1] Dionysius, Cor. in Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 23 ; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3 ; Clemens Al., *Stromata*, iv. 17, § 107, i. 7, § 38, v. 12, § 81, vi. 8, § 65 ; Origen, *De Princip.*, ii. 3, 6 ; *in Ezech.* 8 ; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxvii. 6. Cf. Cyril, Hieros., *Catech.*, xviii. 8.

[2] Eusebius, *H.E.*, iii. 15, 16 ; Hieron., *de Vir. Ill.*, 15 ; Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 113.

the end. Clement of Alexandria calls the supposed writer the "Apostle Clement";[1] Origen reports that many also ascribed to him the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews;[2] and Photius mentions that he was likewise said to be the writer of the Acts of the Apostles.[3] We know that, until a comparatively late date, this Epistle was quoted as Holy Scripture,[4] and was publicly read in the churches at the Sunday meetings of Christians.[5] It has, as we have seen, a place amongst the canonical books of the New Testament in the *Codex Alexandrinus*, but it did not long retain that position in the canon, for, although in the *Apostolic Canons*[6] of the sixth or seventh century both Epistles appear, yet in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus, a work of the ninth century, derived, however, as Credner[7] has demonstrated, from a Syrian catalogue of the fifth century, both Epistles are classed among the Apocrypha.[8]

Great uncertainty prevails as to the date at which the Epistle was written. Reference is supposed to be made to it by the so-called Epistle of Polycarp, but, owing to the probable inauthenticity of that work itself, no weight can be attached to this circumstance. The first certain reference to it is by Hegesippus, in the second half of the second century, mentioned by Eusebius.[9] Dionysius of Corinth, in a letter ascribed to him, addressed to Soter, Bishop of Rome, is the first who distinctly mentions the name of Clement as the author of the Epistle.[10] There is some difference of opinion as to the order of his succession to the Bishopric of Rome. Irenæus[11] and Eusebius[12] say that he followed Anacletus, and the latter adds the date of the twelfth year of the reign of Domitian (A.D. 91–92), and that he died nine years after, in the third year of Trajan's reign (A.D. 100).[13] Internal evidence[14] shows that the Epistle was written after some persecution of the Roman Church, and the selection lies between the persecution under Nero, which would suggest the date A.D. 64–70, or that under Domitian, which would assign the letter to the end of the first century, or to the beginning of the second. Those who adhere to the view that the Clement mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians is the author maintain that the Epistle was written under Nero. One of their principal arguments for this

[1] *Strom.* iv. 17, § 107. [2] Eusebius, *H.E.*, vi. 25.
[3] *Quæst. Amphil.*, Gallandi, *Bibl. Patr.*, 1765, xiii., p. 722.
[4] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 3; Clemens Al., *Strom.*, l.c.
[5] Dion., Cor. in Euseb. *H. E.*, iv. 23, iii. 16; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxx. 15; Hieron., *de Vir. Ill.*, 15.
[6] *Can.* 76 (85). [7] *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, 1847, p. 97 ff.
[8] Credner, *ib.*, p. 122. [9] *H. E.*, iii. 16, iv. 22. [10] Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 23.
[11] *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 3; Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 6.
[12] *H. E.*, iii. 15, cf. 4. [13] *H. E.*, iii. 15, 34. [14] Ch. i.

conclusion is a remark occurring in chapter xli.: "Not everywhere, brethren, are the daily sacrifices offered up, or the votive offerings, or the sin-offerings and the trespass-offerings, but only in Jerusalem. But even there they are not offered in every place, but only at the altar before the Sanctuary, examination of the sacrifice offered being first made by the High Priest and the ministers already mentioned." From this it is concluded that the Epistle was written before the destruction of the Temple. It has, however, been shown that Josephus,[1] the author of the "Epistle to Diognetus" (c. 3), and others, long after the Jewish worship of the Temple was at an end, continually speak in the present tense of the Temple worship in Jerusalem; and it is evident, as Cotelier long ago remarked, that this may be done with propriety even in the present day. The argument is therefore recognised to be without value. Tischendorf, who systematically adopts the earliest possible or impossible dates for all the writings of the first two centuries, decides, without stating his reasons, that the grounds for the earlier date, about A.D. 69, as well as for the episcopate of Clement from A.D. 68–77,[2] are conclusive; but he betrays his more correct impression by classing Clement, in his index, along with Ignatius and Polycarp as representatives of the period, "First and second quarters of the second century";[3] and in the Prolegomena to his New Testament he dates the episcopate of Clement "*ab anno* 92 *usque* 102."[4] The earlier episcopate assigned to him by Hefele upon most insufficient grounds is contradicted by the direct statements of Iræneus, Eusebius, Jerome, and others who give the earliest lists of Roman Bishops,[5] as well as by the internal evidence of the Epistle itself. In chapter xliv. the writer speaks of those appointed by the apostles to the oversight of the Church, "or afterwards by other notable men, the whole Church consenting .....who have for a long time been commended by all, etc.," which indicates successions of Bishops since apostolic days. In another place (chap. xlvii.) he refers the Corinthians to the Epistle addressed to them by Paul "in the beginning of the Gospel," and speaks of "the most stedfast and ancient Church of the Corinthians," which would be absurd in an Epistle written about A.D. 69. Moreover, an advanced episcopal form of Church government is indicated throughout the letter, which is quite

[1] *Antiq.*, iii. 6, 12; *Contra Apion.*, i. 7, ii. 23.

[2] He refers in a note particularly to Hefele, *Patr. Ap.*, 1855, p. 33 ff.

[3] "*Erstes und zweites Viertel des 2 Jahrh. Clemens v. Rom. Ignatius und Polycarp.*" *Wann wurden uns. Evangelien verfasst?* 4th Aufl., 1866, p. 20, cf. *Uebersicht des Inhalts.*

[4] *Nov. Test. Graece, Lips. Sumpt. Ad. Winter, Ed. septima Crit. min. Proleg.*, p. cxxix.

[5] Cf. Lipsius, *Chronologie der röm. Bischöfe, 1869.*

inconsistent with such a date. The great mass of critics, therefore, have decided against the earlier date of the episcopate of Clement, and assign the composition of the Epistle to the end of the first century (A.D. 95–100). Others, however, date it still later. There is no doubt that the great number of Epistles and other writings falsely circulated in the name of Clement may well excite suspicion as to the authenticity of this Epistle also, which is far from unsupported by internal proofs. Of these, however, we shall only mention one. We have already incidentally remarked that the writer mentions the Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, the only instance in which any New Testament writing is referred to by name; but along with the Epistle of the "blessed Paul" the author also speaks of the "blessed Judith," and this leads to the inquiry: When was the Book of Judith written? Hitzig, Volkmar, and others, contend that it must be dated A.D. 117–118,[1] and if this be admitted, it follows, of course, that an Epistle which already shows acquaintance with the Book of Judith cannot have been written before A.D. 120–125 at the earliest, which many, for this and other reasons, affirm to be the case with the Epistle of pseudo-Clement. Whatever date be assigned to it, however, it is probable that the Epistle is interpolated, although it must be added that this is not the view of the majority of critics.

It is important to ascertain whether or not this ancient Christian Epistle affords any evidence of the existence of our Synoptic Gospels at the time when it was written. Tischendorf, who is ever ready to claim the slightest resemblance in language as a reference to New Testament writings, states that, although this Epistle is rich in quotations from the Old Testament, and that Clement here and there also makes use of passages from Pauline Epistles, he nowhere refers to the Gospels.[2] This is perfectly true, but several passages occur in this Epistle which are either quotations from Evangelical works different from ours, or derived from tradition, and in either case they have a very important bearing upon our inquiry.

The first of these passages occurs in ch. xiii., and for greater facility of comparison we shall at once place it both in the Greek and in translation, in juxta-position with the nearest parallel readings in our Synoptic Gospels; and, as far as may be, we shall in the English version indicate differences existing in the original texts. The passage is introduced thus: "Especially remembering

[1] Hitzig, *Zur Kritik d. apokr. Bücher d. A. T.*, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1860, p. 240 ff.; Volkmar, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1856, p. 362 ff., 1857, p. 441 ff. *H'buch. Einl. in d. Apokr.*, 1860, i. p. 268; Baur, *Lehrb. chr. Dogmengeschichte*, 1858, p. 82 anm.; Grœtz, *Gesch. d. Juden vom Unterg. d. jüd. Staates u. s. w.*, 1866, p. 132 ff.

[2] "*Aber nirgends auf die Evangelien.*" *Wann wurden u. s. w.*, p. 20 f.

the words of the Lord Jesus, which he spake teaching gentleness and long-suffering. For thus he said ":—

Epistle, xiii.	Matthew.	Luke.
(α) Be pitiful, that ye may be pitied ;	v. 7. Blessed are the pitiful, for they shall obtain pity.	vi. 36. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful.
(β) forgive, that it may be forgiven to you ;	vi. 14. For if ye forgive men their trespasses, &c.	vi. 37.....pardon[1] and ye shall be pardoned,
(γ) as ye do, so shall it be done to you ;	vii. 12. Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.	vi. 31. And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.
(δ) as ye give, so shall it be given to you ;		vi. 38.....give, and it shall be given to you.
(ε) as ye judge, so shall it be judged to you ;	vii. 2. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged,	vi. 37. Judge not, and ye shall not be judged.
(ζ) as ye show kindness shall kindness be shown to you ;	and	
(η) with what measure ye mete, with the same shall it be measured to you.	with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you.	vi. 38. For with the same measure that ye mete withal, it shall be measured to you again.
(α) Ἐλεᾶτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε.	v. 7 Μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται.	vi. 36 γίνεσθε οὖν οἰκτίρμονες, κ.τ.λ.
(β) ἀφίετε, ἵνα ἀφεθῇ ὑμῖν.	vi. 14 Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, κ.τ.λ.	vi. 37 ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε.
(γ) ὡς ποιεῖτε, οὕτω ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν.	vii. 12 Πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἂν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς.	vi. 31 καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως.
(δ) ὡς δίδοτε, οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.		vi. 38 δίδοτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.
(ε) ὡς κρίνετε, οὕτως κριθήσεσθε ὑμῖν.	vii. 2 ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε,	vi. 37 καὶ μὴ κρίνετε καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε·
(ζ) ὡς χρηστεύεσθε, οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν.		
(η) ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἐν αὐτῷ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.[2]	καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.	vi. 38 τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ ᾧ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

[1] We use this word not as the best equivalent of ἀπολύετε, but merely to indicate to readers unacquainted with Greek the use of a different word from the ἀφῆτε of the first Gospel, and from the ἀφίετε of the Epistle ; and this system we shall adopt as much as possible throughout.

[2] Cf. Mark iv. 24. Cf. *Hom. Clem.* xviii. 16.

Of course, it is understood that, although for convenience of comparison we have broken up this quotation into these phrases, it is quite continuous in the Epistle. It must be evident to anyone who carefully examines the parallel passages that "the words of the Lord Jesus" in the Epistle cannot have been derived from our Gospels. Not only is there no similar consecutive discourse in them, but the scattered phrases which are pointed out as presenting superficial similarity with the quotation are markedly different both in thought and language. In it, as in the "beatitudes" of the "Sermon on the Mount" in the first Gospel, the construction is peculiar and continuous: "Do this..... in order that (ἵνα)....."; or, "As (ὡς) ye do.....so (οὕτως)....." The theory of a combination of passages from memory, which is usually advanced to explain such quotations, cannot serve here, for thoughts and expressions occur in the passage in the Epistle which have no parallel at all in our Gospels, and such dismembered phrases as can be collected from our first and third Synoptics, for comparison with it, follow the course of the quotation in the ensuing order: Matt. v. 7, vi. 14, part of vii. 12, phrase without parallel, first part of vii. 2, phrase without parallel, last part of vii. 2; or Luke vi. 36, last phrase of vi. 37, vi. 31, first phrase of vi. 38, first phrase of vi. 37, phrase without parallel, last phrase of vi. 38.

The only question with regard to this passage, therefore, is whether the writer quotes from an unknown written source or from tradition. He certainly merely professes to repeat "words of the Lord Jesus," and does not definitely indicate a written record; but it is much more probable, from the context, that he quotes from a gospel now no longer extant than that he derives this teaching from oral tradition. He introduces the quotation not only with a remark implying a well-known record: "Remembering the words of the Lord Jesus which he spake, teaching," etc.; but he reiterates: "For *thus* he said," in a way suggesting careful and precise quotation of the very words; and he adds at the end: "By this injunction and by these instructions let us establish ourselves, that we may walk in obedience to his holy words, thinking humbly of ourselves."[1] It seems improbable that the writer would so markedly have indicated a precise quotation of words of Jesus, and would so emphatically have commended them as the rule of life to the Corinthians, had these precepts been mere floating tradition, until then unstamped with written permanence. The phrase, "As ye show kindness (χρηστεύεσθε)," etc., which is

[1] Ταύτῃ τῇ ἐντολῇ καὶ τοῖς παραγγέλμασι τούτοις στηρίξωμεν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὸ πορεύεσθαι ὑπηκόους ὄντας τοῖς ἁγιοπρεπέσι λόγοις αὐτοῦ, ταπεινοφρονοῦντες. c. xiii.

nowhere found in our Gospels, recalls an expression quoted by Justin Martyr, apparently from a Gospel different from ours, and frequently repeated by him in the same form: "Be ye kind and merciful (χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες) as your Father also is kind (χρηστός) and merciful."[1] In the very next chapter of the Epistle a similar reference again occurs: "Let us be kind to each other (χρηστευσώμεθα αὐτοῖς), according to the mercy and benignity of our Creator."[2] Without, however, going more minutely into this question, it is certain, from its essential variations in language, thought, and order, that the passage in the Epistle cannot be claimed as a compilation from our Gospels; and we shall presently see that some of the expressions in it which are foreign to our Gospels are elsewhere quoted by other Fathers, and there is reason to believe that these "words of the Lord Jesus" were not derived from tradition, but from a written source different from our Gospels. When the great difference which exists between the parallel passages in the first and third Synoptics, and still more between these and the second, is considered, it is easy to understand that other Gospels may have contained a version differing as much from them as they do from each other.

We likewise subjoin the next passage to which we must refer with the nearest parallels in our Synoptics. We may explain that the writer of the Epistle is rebuking the Corinthians for strifes and divisions amongst them, and for forgetting that they "are members one of another," and he continues (c. xlvi.): "Remember the words of our Lord Jesus; for he said:—"

Epistle, xlvi.	Matthew.	Luke.
Woe to that man;	xxvi. 24. Woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is delivered up; (it were) well for him if that man had not been born.	xvii. 1...but woe... through whom they (offences) come.
(it were) well for him if he had not been born (rather) than that he should offend one of my elect;	xviii. 6. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were profitable for him that a great millstone were suspended upon his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.	
it were) better for him (that) a millstone should be attached (to him) and he should be drowned in the sea, (rather) than that he should pervert one of my elect.		xvii. 2. It were advantageous for him that a great millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast in the sea, (rather) than that he offend one of these little ones.

Mark xiv. 21.....but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is delivered

[1] *Apol.*, i. 15, and again twice in *Dial.* 96. [2] c. xiv.

up, (it were) well for him if that man had not been born.....ix. 42. And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it is well for him rather that a great millstone were hanged about his neck, and he thrown in the sea.

EPISTLE, XLVI.	MATTHEW.	LUKE.
Οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ·	XXVI. 24 οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι οὗ ὁ υἱος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται·	XVII. 1 οὐαὶ δὲ δι' οὗ ἔρχεται· (τὰ σκάνδαλα)[1]
καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη	καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος. XVIII. 6 ὃς δ' ἂν	
ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι·	σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ,	XVII. 2
κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτῷ περιτεθῆναι μύλον,	συμφέρει αὐτῷ ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλος ὀνικὸς περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ	λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ εἰ μύλος ὀνικὸς[2] περίκειται περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ
καὶ καταποντισθῆναι	καὶ καταποντισθῇ ἐν τῷ πελάγει	καὶ ἔρριπται
εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου διαστρέψαι.	τῆς θαλάσσης.	εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα[3] τῶν μικρῶν τούτων.

This quotation is clearly not from our Gospels, but must be assigned to a different written source. The writer would scarcely refer the Corinthians to such words of Jesus if they were merely traditional. It is neither a combination of texts nor a quotation from memory. The language throughout is markedly different from any passage in the Synoptics, and to present even a superficial parallel it is necessary to take a fragment of the discourse of Jesus at the Last Supper regarding the traitor who should deliver him up (Matt. xxvi. 24), and join it to a fragment of his remarks in connection with the little child whom he set in the midst (xviii. 6). The parallel passage in Luke has not the opening words of the passage in the Epistle at all, and the portion which it contains (xvii. 2) is separated from the context in which it stands in the first Gospel, and which explains its meaning. If we contrast the parallel passages in the three Synoptics, their differences of context are very suggestive; and, without referring to their numerous and important variations in detail, the confusion amongst them is evidence of very varying tradition.[4] This alone would make the existence of another form like that quoted in the Epistle before us more than probable.

Tischendorf, in a note to his statement that Clement nowhere

[1] *The Cod. Sin.* and *Cod. D.* (Bezæ), insert πλὴν before οὐαι.

[2] *Cod. Sin.* and *D.* read λίθος μυλικὸς instead of μύλος.

[3] The Vatican (B.) and Sinaitic, as well as most of the other Codices, put ἕνα at the end of the phrase.

[4] Cf. Matt. xviii. 1–8; Mark ix. 33–43; Luke ix. 46–48, 49–50, xvii. 1–3.

refers to the Gospels, quotes the passage we are now considering, the only one to which he alludes, and says: "These words are expressly cited as 'words of Jesus our Lord,' but they denote much more oral apostolic tradition than a use of the parallel passages in Matt. (xxvi. 24; xviii. 6) and Luke (xvii. 2)."[1] It is now, of course, impossible to determine finally whether the passage was actually derived from tradition or from a written source different from our Gospels; but, in either case, the fact is that the Epistle not only does not afford the slightest evidence for the existence of any of our Gospels, but, from only making use of tradition or an apocryphal work as the source of information regarding words of Jesus, it is decidedly opposed to the pretensions made on behalf of the Synoptics.

Before passing on, we may, in the briefest way possible, refer to one or two other passages, with the view of further illustrating the character of the quotations in this Epistle. There are many passages cited which are not found in the Old Testament, and others which have no parallels in the New. At the beginning of the very chapter in which the words which we have just been considering occur there is the following quotation: "It is written: Cleave to the holy, for they who cleave to them shall be made holy,"[2] the source of which is unknown. In a previous chapter the writer says: "And our Apostles knew, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that there will be contention regarding the name (*ὀνόματος*, office, dignity) of the episcopate."[3] What was the writer's authority for this statement? We find Justin Martyr quoting, as an express prediction of Jesus: "There shall be schisms and heresies,"[4] which is not contained in our Gospels, but evidently derived from an uncanonical source—a fact rendered more apparent by the occurrence of a similar passage in the *Clementine Homilies*, still more closely bearing upon our Epistle: "For there shall be, as the Lord said, false apostles, false prophets, heresies, desires for supremacy."[5] Hegesippus also speaks in a similar way: "From these came the false Christs, false prophets, false apostles who divided the unity of the Church."[6] As

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 21, anm. 2. Cf. Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, ii. *Clement of Rome*, 1890, p. 141.

[2] Γέγαπται γάρ· "Κολλᾶσθε τοῖς ἁγίοις, ὅτι οἱ κολλώμενοι αὐτοῖς ἁγιασθήσονται. c. xlvi., cf. c. xxx. A similar expression occurs in Clement of Alexandria. *Strom.* v. 8, § 53.

[3] Καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. C. xliv., cf. xlv., xlvi.

[4] Ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἱρέσεις. *Dial. c. Tryph.* 35, cf. 51.

[5] Ἔσονται γάρ, ὡς ὁ κύριος εἶπεν, ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδεῖς προφῆται, αἱρέσεις, φιλαρχίαι· *Clem. Hom.*, xvi. 21; cf. *Constit. Apost.*, vi. 13; *Clem. Recog.*, iv. 34.

[6] Ἀπὸ τούτων ψευδόχριστοι ψευδοπροφῆται, ψευδαπόστολοι, οἵτινες ἐμέρισαν τὴν ἕνωσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, κ, τ. λ. Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 22.

Hegesippus, and in all probability Justin Martyr and the author of the *Clementines*, made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or to Peter, it is probable that these Gospels contained passages to which the words of the Epistle may refer.[1] It may be well to point out that the author also cites a passage from the fourth Book of Ezra, ii. 16 :[2] "And I shall remember the good day, and I shall raise you from your tombs."[3] Ezra reads : "*Et resuscitabo mortuos de locis suis et de monumentis educam illos*," etc. The first part of the quotation in the Epistle, of which we have only given the latter clause above, is taken from Isaiah xxvi. 20 ; but there can be no doubt that the above is from this apocryphal book, which, as we shall see, was much used in the early Church.

We now turn to the so-called "Epistle of Barnabas," another interesting relic of the early Church, many points in whose history have considerable analogy with that of the Epistle of pseudo-Clement. The letter itself bears no author's name, is not dated from any place, and is not addressed to any special community. Towards the end of the second century, however, tradition began to ascribe it to Barnabas, the companion of Paul.[4] The first writer who mentions it is Clement of Alexandria, who calls its author several times the "Apostle Barnabas";[5] and Eusebius says that he gave an account of it in one of his works now no longer extant.[6] Origen also refers to it, calling it a "Catholic Epistle," and quoting it as Scripture.[7] We have already seen in the case of the Epistles ascribed to Clement of Rome—and, as we proceed, we shall become only too familiar with the fact—the singular facility with which, in the total absence of critical discrimination, spurious writings were ascribed by the Fathers to Apostles and their followers. In many cases such writings were deliberately inscribed with names well known in the Church ; but both in the case of the two Epistles to the Corinthians and the letter we are now considering no such pious fraud was attempted, nor was it necessary. Credulous piety, which attributed writings to every Apostle, and even to Jesus himself, soon found authors for each anonymous work of an edifying character. To Barnabas, the

[1] See other instances in chapters xvii., xxiii., xxvi., xxvii., xxx., xlii., xlvii., etc.

[2] 2 *Esdras* of the English authorised *Apocrypha*.

[3] καὶ μνησθήσομαι ἡμέρας ἀγαθῆς, καὶ ἀναστήσω ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῶν θηκῶν ὑμῶν. c. L.

[4] Acts iv. 36, xi. 22 f., 30, xii. 25, etc.

[5] *Stromata* ii., 6, § 31, 7, § 35, 20, § 116, v. 10, § 64, cf. 15, § 67, 18, § 84, v. § 52.

[6] *H. E.*, vi. 14, cf. 13.

[7] γέγραπται δὴ ἐν τῇ Βαρνάβα καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ, κ. τ. λ. *Contra Cels.*, i. 63, cf. *De Princip.*, iii. 2, § 4.

friend of Paul, not only this Epistle was referred, but he was also reported by Tertullian and others to be the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews;[1] and an apocryphal "Gospel according to Barnabas," said to have had close affinity with our first Synoptic, is condemned, along with many others, in the decretal of Gelasius.[2] Eusebius, however, classes the so-called "Epistle of Barnabas" amongst the spurious books (ἐν τοῖς νόθοις),[3] and elsewhere also speaks of it as uncanonical.[4] Jerome mentions it as read amongst apocryphal writings.[5] Had the Epistle been seriously regarded as a work of the "Apostle" Barnabas, it could scarcely have failed to attain canonical rank. That it was highly valued by the early Church is shown by the fact that it stands, along with the Shepherd of Hermas, after the canonical books of the New Testament in the *Codex Sinaiticus*, which is probably the most ancient MS. of them now known. In the earlier days of criticism some writers, without much question, adopted the traditional view as to the authorship of the Epistle; but the great mass of critics are now agreed in asserting that the composition, which itself is perfectly anonymous, cannot be attributed to Barnabas, the friend and fellow-worker of Paul. Those who maintain the former opinion date the Epistle about A.D. 70–73, or even earlier; but this is scarcely the view of any living critic. There are many indications in the Epistle which render such a date impossible; but we do not propose to go into the argument minutely, for it is generally admitted that, whilst there is a clear limit further back than which the Epistle cannot be set, there is little or no certainty how far into the second century its composition may not reasonably be advanced. Critics are divided upon the point; a few are disposed to date the Epistle about the end of the first or beginning of the second century, while a still greater number assign it to the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117–138); and others, not without reason, consider that it exhibits marks of a still later period. It is probable that it is more or less interpolated. Until the discovery of the Sinaitic MS. a portion of the "Epistle of Barnabas" was only known through an ancient Latin version, the first four and a half chapters of the Greek having been lost. The Greek text,

[1] *De Pudic.*, § 20; Hieron., *De vir. ill.* 5. Many modern writers have supported the tradition. Cf. Credner, *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 175 ff.; Thiersch, *Die Kirche im ap. Zeit.*, p. 199 ff.; Ullmann, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1828, p. 377 ff.; Wieseler, *Unters. üb. d. Hebräerbrief*, 1861, i., p. 32 ff.

[2] *Decretum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, in Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, 1847, p. 215. Cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 341; Grabe, *Spicil. Patr.*, i., p. 303.

[3] *H. E.*, iii. 25.

[4] *H. E.*, vi. 14, cf. 13.

[5] Hieron, *De vir. ill.* 6, *Comment.* in *Ezech.*, xliii. 19.

however, is now complete, although often very corrupt. The author quotes largely from the Old Testament, and also from apocryphal works. He nowhere mentions any book or writer of the New Testament, and, with one asserted exception, which we shall presently examine, he quotes no passage agreeing with our Gospels. We shall refer to these, commencing at once with the most important.

In the ancient Latin translation of the Epistle the only form, as we have just said, in which, until the discovery of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, the first four and a half chapters were extant, the following passage occurs: "*Adtendamus ergo, ne forte, sicut scriptum est, multi vocati pauci electi inveniamur.*"[1] "Let us, therefore beware lest, as it is written: Many are called, few are chosen." These words are found in our first Gospel (xxii. 14), and, as the formula by which they are here introduced—"it is written"—is generally understood to indicate a quotation from Holy Scripture, it was, and is, argued by some that here we have a passage from one of our Gospels quoted in a manner which shows that, at the time the Epistle of Barnabas was written, the "Gospel according to Matthew was already considered Holy Scripture."[2] Whilst this portion of the text existed only in the Latin version, it was argued that the "*sicut scriptum est*," at least, must be an interpolation, and in any case that it could not be deliberately applied, at that date, to a passage in any writings of the New Testament. On the discovery of the Sinaitic MS., however, the words were found in the Greek text in that Codex: προσέχωμεν, μήποτε, ὡς γέγραπται, πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ εὑρεθῶμεν. The question, therefore, is so far modified that, however much we may suspect the Greek text of interpolation, it must be accepted as the basis of discussion that this passage, whatever its value, exists in the oldest, and indeed only (and this point must not be forgotten), complete MS. of the Greek Epistle.

Now, with regard to the value of the expression "it is written," it may be remarked that in no case could its use in the Epistle of Barnabas indicate more than individual opinion, and it could not, for reasons to be presently given, be considered to represent the decision of the Church. In the very same chapter in which the formula is used in connection with the passage we are considering, it is also employed to introduce a quotation from the Book of Enoch,[3] περὶ οὗ γέγραπται, ὡς Ἐνὼχ λέγει, and elsewhere (c. xii.) he quotes from another apocryphal book[4] as one of the prophets. "Again, he refers to the Cross of Christ in another prophet,

[1] Ch. iv. [2] Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 92 ff.
[3] Enoch lxxxix. 61 f., xc. 17. This book is again quoted in ch. xvi.
[4] Cf. 4 Ezra iv. 33, v. 5.

saying: 'And when shall these things come to pass? and the Lord saith: When,' etc.....ἐν ἄλλῳ προφήτῃ λέγοντι.....λέγει Κύριος· κ.τ.λ." He also quotes (ch. vi.) the apocryphal "Book of Wisdom" as Holy Scripture, and in like manner several other unknown works. When it is remembered that the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Epistle of Barnabas itself, and many other apocryphal works, have been quoted by the Fathers as Holy Scripture, the distinctive value of such an expression may be understood.

With this passing remark, however, we proceed to say that this supposed quotation from Matthew as Holy Scripture, by proving too much, destroys its own value as evidence. The generality of competent and impartial critics are agreed that it is impossible to entertain the idea that one of our Gospels could have held the rank of Holy Scripture at the date of this Epistle, seeing that, for more than half a century after, the sharpest line was drawn between the writings of the Old Testament and of the New, and the former alone quoted as, or accorded the consideration of, Holy Scripture. If this were actually a quotation from our first Gospel, already in the position of Holy Scripture, it would, indeed, be astonishing that the Epistle, putting out of the question other Christian writings for half a century after it, teeming, as it does, with extracts from the Old Testament, and from known and unknown apocryphal works, should thus limit its use of the Gospel to a few words, totally neglecting the rich store which it contains, and quoting, on the other hand, sayings of Jesus not recorded at all in any of our Synoptics. It is most improbable that, if the author of the "Epistle of Barnabas" was acquainted with any one of our Gospels, and considered it an inspired and canonical work, he could have neglected it in such a manner. The peculiarity of the quotation which he is supposed to make, which we shall presently point out, renders such limitation to it doubly singular upon any such hypothesis. The unreasonable nature of the assertion, however, will become more apparent as we proceed with our examination, and perceive that none of the early writers quote our Gospels, if they knew them at all, but, on the other hand, make use of other works, and that the inference that Matthew was considered Holy Scripture, therefore, rests solely upon this quotation of half-a-dozen words.

The application of such a formula to a supposed quotation from one of our Gospels, in so isolated an instance, led to the belief that, even if the passage were taken from our first Synoptic, the author of the Epistle, in quoting it, laboured under the impression that it was derived from some prophetical book. We daily see how difficult it is to trace the source even of the most familiar quotations. Instances of such confusion of memory are frequent

in the writings of the Fathers, and many can be pointed out in the New Testament itself. For instance, in Matt. xxvii. 9 f. the passage from Zechariah xi. 12, 13, is attributed to Jeremiah; in Mark i. 2 a quotation from Malachi iii. 1 is ascribed to Isaiah. In 1 Corinthians ii. 9 a passage is quoted as Holy Scripture which is not found in the Old Testament at all, but which is taken, as Origen and Jerome state, from an apocryphal work, "The Revelation of Elias";[1] and the passage is similarly quoted by the so-called Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians (xxxiv.). Then in what prophet did the author of the first Gospel find the words (xiii. 35): "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet,[2] saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world"?

Orelli,[3] afterwards followed by many others, suggested that the quotation was probably intended for one in 4 Ezra viii. 3: "*Nam multi creati sunt, pauci autem salvabuntur.*"[4] "For many are created, but few shall be saved." Bretschneider proposed, as an emendation of the passage in Ezra, the substitution of "*vocati*" for "*creati*"; but, however plausible, his argument did not meet with much favour. Along with this passage was also suggested a similar expression in 4 Ezra ix. 15: "*Plures sunt qui pereunt, quam qui salvabuntur.*" "There are more who perish than who shall be saved."[5] The Greek of the three passages may read as follows:—

Mt. xxii. 14.	Πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν, κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.
Ep. Bar. iv.	Πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.
4 Ezra, viii. 3	Πολλοὶ γάρ ἐγεννήθησαν, ὀλίγοι δὲ σωθήσονται.

There can be no doubt that the sense of the reading in 4 Ezra is exactly that of the Epistle, but the language is somewhat different. We must not forget, however, that the original Greek of 4 Ezra is lost, and that we are wholly dependent on the versions and MSS. extant, regarding whose numerous variations and great corruption there are no differences of opinion. Orelli's theory, moreover, is supported by the fact that the Epistle, elsewhere (c. xii.), quotes from 4 Ezra (iv. 33; v. 5).

On examining the passage as it occurs in our first Synoptic, we are, at the very outset, struck by the singular fact that this short

[1] Origen, *Tract.*, xxxv., § 17 *Matt.*; *Hieron. ad Isaiæ*, lxiv., *Epist.* ci.; cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr., N. T.*, i., p. 342.

[2] In the *Cod. Sinaiticus* a later hand has here inserted "Isaiah."

[3] *Selecta Patr.*, p. 5. [4] Cf. Volkmar, *Hbuch Einl. Apocr.* ii., p. 105.

[5] We might also point to the verse x. 97, "For thou art blessed above many, and art called near to the Most High, and so are but few." "*Tu enim beatus es præ multis, et vocatus es apud Altissimum, sicut et pauci.*"

saying appears twice in that Gospel with a different context, and in each case without any propriety of application to what precedes it, whilst it is not found at all in either of the other two Synoptics. The first time we meet with it is at the close of the parable of the labourers in the vineyard.[1] The householder engages the labourers at different hours of the day, and pays those who had worked but one hour the same wages as those who had borne the burden and heat of the day, and the reflection at the close is (xx. 16): "Thus the last shall be first, and the first last; for many are called, but few chosen." It is perfectly evident that neither of these sayings, but especially not that with which we are concerned, has any connection with the parable at all. There is no question of many or few, or of selection or rejection; all the labourers are engaged and paid alike. If there be a moral at all to the parable, it is the justification of the master: "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" It is impossible to imagine a saying more irrelevant to its context than "many are called, but few chosen," in such a place. The passage occurs again (xxii. 14) in connection with the parable of the king who made a marriage for his son. The guests who are at first invited refuse to come, and are destroyed by the king's armies; but the wedding is, nevertheless, "furnished with guests" by gathering together as many as are found in the highways. A new episode commences when the king comes in to see the guests (v. 11). He observes a man there who has not on a wedding garment, and he desires the servants to (v. 13) "Bind him hand and foot, and cast him into the darkness without," where "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth";[2] and then comes our passage (v. 14), "For many are called, but few chosen." Now, whether applied to the first or to the latter part of the parable, the saying is irrelevant. The guests first called were in fact chosen as much as the last, but themselves refused to come, and of all those who, being "called" from the highways and byways, ultimately furnished the wedding with guests in their stead, only one was rejected. It is clear that the facts here distinctly contradict the moral that "few are chosen." In both places the saying is, as it were, "dragged in by the hair." On examination, however, we find that the oldest MSS. of the New Testament omit the sentence from Matthew xx. 16. It is neither found in the Sinaitic nor Vatican codices, and whilst it has not the support of the *Codex Alexandrinus*, which is defective at the

[1] Matt. xx. 1–16.

[2] This is not the place to criticise the expectation of finding a wedding garment on a guest hurried in from highways and byways, or the punishment inflicted for such an offence, as questions affecting the character of the parable.

part, nor of the Dublin rescript (z), which omits it, many other MSS. are also without it. The total irrelevancy of the saying to its context, its omission by the oldest authorities from Matt. xx. 16, where it appears in later MSS., and its total absence from both of the other Gospels, must at once strike everyone as peculiar, and as very unfortunate, to say the least of it, for those who make extreme assertions with regard to its supposed quotation by the Epistle of Barnabas. Weizsäcker, with great probability, suggests that in this passage we have merely a well-known proverb,[1] which the author of the first Gospel has introduced into his work from some uncanonical or other source, and placed in the mouth of Jesus.[2] Certainly, under the circumstances, it can scarcely be maintained in its present context as a historical saying of Jesus. Ewald, who naturally omits it from Matthew xx. 16, ascribes the parable: xx. 1–16, as well as that: xxii. 1–14, in which it stands, originally to the Spruchsammlung[3] or collection of discourses, out of which, with intermediate works, he considers that our first Gospel was composed.[4] However this may be, there is, it seems to us, good reason for believing that it was not originally a part of these parables, and that it is not in that sense historical; and there is, therefore, no ground for asserting that it may not have been derived by the author of the Gospel from some older work, from which also it may have come into the "Epistle of Barnabas."[5]

There is, however, another passage which deserves to be mentioned. The Epistle has the following quotation: "Again, I will show thee how, in regard to us, the Lord saith, He made a new creation in the last times. The Lord saith, Behold I make the first as the last."[6] Even Tischendorf does not claim this as a

[1] An illustration of such proverbial sayings is found in the Phaedo of Plato: *εἰσὶ γὰρ δή, φασὶν οἱ περὶ τὰς τελετὰς, ναρθηκοφόροι μὲν πολλοί, βάκχοι δέ τε παῦροι, ed. Steph.*, i., p. 69, "For many, as they say in the Mysteries, are the thyrsus-bearers, but few are the mystics." Cf. Jowett, *Plato*, i., p. 441, p. 381.

[2] *Zur Kr. des Barnabasbr.*, p. 34 f. [In the fourth edition of his work on the Canon, Dr. Westcott very fairly states in a note: "On the other hand, it is just to add that the proverbial form of the saying ('Many are called, but few chosen') is such as to admit of the supposition that it may have been derived by Barnabas from some older book than St. Matthew," p. 51, note 2.]

[3] *Die drei ersten Evv.*, 1850. [4] *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, ii., 1849, p. 191 ff.

[5] Professor A. D. Loman, who impartially and ably discusses this quotation, is unable to admit that the passage is taken from our first Synoptic; and he conjectures that the common source from which both the Synoptist and the author of the Epistle may have derived the saying may be a work which he supposes to be referred to in Luke xi. 49, *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1872, p. 196 f.; cf. 1867, p. 553, p. 559.

[6] Πάλιν σοι ἐπιδείξω, πῶς πρὸς ἡμᾶς λέγει κύριος· δεύτεραν πλάσιν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων ἐποίησεν. λέγει κύριος· Ἰδοῦ, ποιῶ τὰ ἔσχατα ὡς τὰ πρῶτα. c. vi.

quotation of Matt. xx. 16,[1] "Thus the last shall be first and the first last" (οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι), the sense of which is quite different. The application of the saying in this place in the first, and, indeed, in the other, Synoptic Gospels is evidently quite false, and depends merely on the ring of words and not of ideas. In xix. 30 it is quoted a second time, quite irrelevantly, with some variation: "But many first shall be last, and last first" (πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι). Now, it will be remembered that at xx. 16 it occurs in several MSS. in connection with "Many are called, but few are chosen," although the oldest codices omit the latter passage, and most critics consider it interpolated. The separate quotation of these two passages by the author of the Epistle, with so marked a variation in the second, renders it most probable that he found both in the source from which he quotes. We have, however, more than sufficiently discussed this passage. The author of the Epistle does not indicate any source from which he makes his quotation; and the mere existence in the first Synoptic of a proverbial saying like this does not in the least involve the conclusion that it is necessarily the writing from which the quotation was derived, more especially as apocryphal works are repeatedly cited in the Epistle. If it be maintained that the saying is really historical, it is obvious that the prescriptive right of our Synoptic is at once excluded, and it may have been the common property of a score of evangelical works.

There can be no doubt that many Scriptural texts have crept into early Christian writings which originally had no place there; and where attendant circumstances are suspicious, it is always well to remember the fact. An instance of the interpolation of which we speak is found in the "Epistle of Barnabas." In one place, the phrase, "Give to everyone that asketh of thee" (παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου),[2] occurs, not as a quotation, but merely woven into the Greek text as it existed before the discovery of the Sinaitic MS. This phrase is the same as the precept in Luke vi. 30, although it was argued by some that, as no other trace of the third Gospel existed in the Epistle, it was more probably an alteration of the text of Matt. v. 42. Omitting the phrase from the passage in the Epistle, the text read as follows: "Thou shalt not hesitate to give, neither shalt thou murmur when thou givest.....so shalt thou know who is the good Recompenser of the reward." The supposed quotation, inserted where we have left a

[1] Dr. Westcott does not make any reference to it either. [In the 4th ed. of his work on the Canon (p. 62) he expresses an opinion that it is a reference "to some passage of the O. T.," and suggests Ezek. xxxvi. 11.]

[2] Ch. xix.

blank, really interrupted the sense, and repeated the previous injunction. The oldest MS., the *Codex Sinaiticus*, omits the quotation, and so ends the question, but it is afterwards inserted by another hand. Some pious scribe, in fact, seeing the relation of the passage to the Gospel, had added the words in the margin as a gloss, and they afterwards found their way into the text. In this manner very many similar glosses have crept into texts which they were originally intended to illustrate.[1]

Tischendorf, who does not allude to this, lays much stress upon the following passage: "But when he selected His own apostles, who should preach His Gospel, who were sinners above all sin, in order that he might show that He came not to call the righteous, but sinners, then He manifested Himself to be the Son of God."[2] We may remark that in the common Greek text the words "to repentance" were inserted after "sinners," but they are not found in the Sinaitic MS. In like manner many Codices insert them in Matt. ix. 13 and Mark ii. 17, but they are not found in some of the oldest MSS., and are generally rejected. Tischendorf considers them a later addition both to the text of the Gospel and of the Epistle.[3] But this very fact is suggestive. It is clear that a supposed quotation has been deliberately adjusted to what was considered to be the text of the Gospel. Why should the whole phrase not be equally an interpolation? We shall presently see that there is reason to think that it is so. Although there is no quotation in the passage, who, asks Tischendorf,[4] could mistake the words as they stand in Matt. ix. 13, "For I came not to call the righteous, but sinners"? This passage is referred to by Origen in his work against Celsus, in a way which indicates that the supposed quotation did not exist in his copy. Origen says: "And as Celsus has called the Apostles of Jesus infamous men, saying that they were tax-gatherers and worthless sailors, we have to remark on this, that, etc.....Now, in the Catholic Epistle of Barnabas, from which, perhaps, Celsus derived the statement that the Apostles were infamous and wicked men, it is written that 'Jesus selected his own Apostles, who were sinners above all sin,'"[5] and then he goes on to quote the expression of Peter to Jesus (Luke v. 8), and then 1 Timothy i. 15; but he nowhere

[1] The phrase, "Give to everyone that asketh of thee," occurs also in the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," i., § 5, with which little treatise, published since the complete edition of this work was issued, several other passages in the Epistle agree—cf. p. 149 ff.

[2] "Οτε δὲ τοὺς ἰδίους ἀποστόλους τοὺς μέλλοντας κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ ἐξελέξατο, ὄντας ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομωτέρους, ἵνα δείξῃ, ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθεν καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς, τότε ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν θεοῦ. c. v.

[3] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 96, anm. 1.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 96.

[5] *Contra Cels.*, i. 63.

refers to the supposed quotation in the Epistle. Now, if we read the passage without the quotation, we have: "But when he selected his own Apostles who should preach his Gospel, who were sinners above all sin.....then he manifested himself to be the Son of God." Here a pious scribe very probably added in the margin the gloss, "in order that he might show that he came not to call the righteous, but sinners," to explain the passage; and, as in the case of the phrase, "Give to every one that asketh of thee," the gloss became subsequently incorporated with the text. The Epistle, however, goes on to give the only explanation which the author intended, and which clashes with that of the scribe. "For, if he had not come in the flesh, how could men have been saved by beholding him? Seeing that looking on the sun that shall cease to be, the work of his hands, they have not even power to endure his rays. Accordingly, the Son of Man came in the flesh for this, that he might bring to a head the number of their sins who had persecuted to death his prophets."[1] The argument of Origen bears out this view, for he does not at all take the explanation of the gloss as to why Jesus chose his disciples from such a class, but he reasons: "What is there strange, therefore, that Jesus, being minded to manifest to the race of men his power to heal souls, should have selected infamous and wicked men, and should have elevated them so far that they became a pattern of the purest virtue to those who were brought by their persuasion to the Gospel of Christ?"[2] The argument, both of the author of the Epistle and of Origen, is different from that suggested by the phrase under examination, and we consider it a mere gloss introduced into the text; which, as the *εἰς μετάνοιαν* shows, has, in the estimation of Tischendorf himself, been deliberately altered. Even if it originally formed part of the text, however, it would be wrong to affirm that it affords proof of the use or existence of the first Gospel. The words of Jesus in Matt. ix. 12–14 evidently belong to the oldest tradition of the Gospel, and, in fact, Ewald ascribes them, apart from the remainder of the chapter, originally to the Spruchsammlung, from which, with two intermediate books, he considers that our present Matthew was composed.[3] Nothing can be more certain than that such sayings, if they be admitted to be historical at all, must have existed in many other works, and the mere fact of their happening to be also in one of the Gospels which has survived cannot prove its use, or even its existence at the time the Epistle of Barnabas was written, more especially as the phrase does not occur as a quotation, and there is no indication of the source from which it was derived.

Tischendorf, however, finds a further analogy between the

[1] c. v. [2] *Contra Cels.*, i. 63. [3] *Die drei ersten Evv.*, p. 15, p. 1.

Epistle and the Gospel of Matthew, in ch. xii. "Since, therefore, in the future they were to say that Christ is the son of David, fearing and perceiving clearly the error of the wicked, David himself prophesies: 'The Lord said unto my Lord, sit at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.'" Tischendorf, upon this, inquires, "Could Barnabas so write without the supposition that his readers had Matt. xxii. 41 ff. before them, and does not such a supposition likewise infer the actual authority of Matthew's Gospel?"[1] Such rapid argument and extreme conclusions are startling indeed; but, in his haste, our critic has forgotten to state the whole case. The author of the Epistle has been elaborately showing that the Cross of Christ is repeatedly typified in the Old Testament, and at the commencement of the chapter, after quoting the passage from 4 Ezra iv. 33, v. 5, he points to the case of Moses, to whose heart "the spirit speaks that he should make a form of the cross," by stretching forth his arms in supplication, and so long as he did so Israel prevailed over their enemies; and again he typified the cross when he set up the brazen serpent upon which the people might look and be healed. Then, that which Moses as a prophet said to Joshua (Jesus), the son of Nave, when he gave him that name, was solely for the purpose that all the people might hear that the Father would reveal all things regarding his Son to the son of Nave. This name being given to him when he was sent to spy out the land, Moses said: "Take a book in thy hands, and write what the Lord saith, that the Son of God will in the last days cut off by the roots all the house of Amelek." This, of course, is a falsification of the passage, Exodus xvii. 14, for the purpose of making it declare Jesus to be the "Son of God." Then, proceeding in the same strain, he says: "Behold again, Jesus is not the son of Man, but the Son of God, manifested in the type and in the flesh. Since, therefore, in the future, they were to say that Christ is the son of David" (and here follows the passage we are discussing) "fearing and perceiving clearly the error of the wicked, David himself prophesied: 'The Lord said unto my Lord, sit at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.' And again, thus speaks Isaiah: 'The Lord said to Christ my Lord, whose right hand I have held, that the nations may obey Him, and I will break in pieces the strength of kings.' Behold how David calleth Him Lord, and the Son of God." And here end the chapter and the subject. Now it is quite clear that the passage occurs, not as a reference to any such dilemma as that in Matt. xxii. 41 ff., but simply as one of many passages which, at the commencement of our era, were considered prophetic declarations of the divinity of

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 96.

Christ, in opposition to the expectation of the Jews that the Messiah was to be the son of David;[1] and, as we have seen, in order to prove his point, the author alters the text. To argue that such a passage of a Psalm, quoted in such a manner in this Epistle, proves the use of our first Synoptic is in the highest degree arbitrary.

We have already pointed out that the author quotes apocryphal works as Holy Scripture, and we may now add that he likewise cites words of Jesus which are nowhere found in our Gospels. For instance, in ch. vii. we meet with the following expressions directly attributed to Jesus. "Thus he says: 'Those who desire to behold me and to attain my kingdom must through tribulation and suffering receive me.'" Hilgenfeld[2] compares this with another passage, similar in sense, in 4 Ezra vii. 14; but in any case it is not a quotation from our Gospels; and, with so many passages in them suitable to his purpose, it would be amazing if he knew and held Matthew in the consideration which Tischendorf asserts, that he should neglect their stores, and go elsewhere for such quotations. There is nothing in this Epistle worthy of the name of evidence even of the existence of our Gospels.

The "Shepherd" of Hermas is another work which very nearly secured permanent canonical rank with the writings of the New Testament. It was quoted as Holy Scripture by the Fathers, and held to be divinely inspired, and it was publicly read in the churches.[3] It has a place with the "Epistle of Barnabas," in the *Sinaitic Codex* after the canonical books. In early times it was attributed to the Hermas who is mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans xiv. 14, in consequence of a mere conjecture to that effect by Origen;[4] but the Canon of Muratori[5] confidently ascribes it to a brother of Pius, Bishop of Rome, and, at least, there does not seem any ground for the statement of Origen. It may have been written about the middle of the second century or a little earlier.

Tischendorf dismisses this important memorial of the early Christian Church with a note of two lines, for it has no quota-

[1] Cf. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrh. des Heils*, ii., p. 219 ff., 258 ff., 292 ff.

[2] *Die Proph. Ezra u. Daniel*, p. 70.

[3] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 20, § 2; Clemens Al., *Strom.*, i. 29, § 181, ii. 1, § 3, vi. 15, § 131; Tertullian, *De Orat.*, 12. He rejected it later. *De Pudic.*, 10; Origen, *Comm. in Rom., lib.* x. 31, *Hom.*, viii. in Num., *Hom.* i. in Psalm 37, *De Princip.*, ii. 1, § 3, iii. 2, § 4; cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 3, v. 8; iii. 25; Cotelier, *Patr. Ap.*, i. 68 f.

[4] *Puto autem quod Hermas iste sit scriptor libelli illius qui Pastor appelatur, quæ scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur, et ut puto divinitus inspirata.* In *Rom. lib.* x. 31.

[5] Routh, *Reliq. Sacræ*, i., p. 396; Tregelles, *Canon Murat.*, p. 20.

tions either from the Old or New Testament.[1] He does not even suggest that it contains any indications of acquaintance with our Gospels. The only direct quotation in the "Shepherd" is from an apocryphal work which is cited as Holy Scripture: "The Lord is nigh unto them who return to him, as it is written in Eldad and Modat, who prophesied to the people in the wilderness."[2] This work, which appears in the Stichometry of Nicephorus amongst the apocrypha of the Old Testament, is no longer extant.

THE TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES.

In 1873, Bryennius, then Metropolitan of Serræ, and now Patriarch of Nicomedia, discovered an interesting MS. volume in the library of the Jerusalem Monastery of the Most Holy Sepulchre at Constantinople. It contained seven Greek documents, amongst which may be mentioned the Epistle of Barnabas, the first Epistle of Clement in the only complete form known, the spurious second Epistle of Clement, Epistle of Mary of Cassoboli to Ignatius the Martyr of Antioch, twelve Epistles of pseudo-Ignatius, and the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," with which we are now concerned. At the end of the MS. volume is the signature of the copyist, "Leon, notary and sinner," with a date which corresponds with A.D. 1056. In 1875, Bryennius published the two Epistles of Clement; but it was not until the close of 1883 that he was able to lay before the world the Greek text of the short treatise in which we are now interested,[3] and, as an able writer has truly remarked, it has ever since been "the spoiled child of criticism."[4] Bryennius himself assigns the "Teaching" to a date between A.D. 120–160.

Several ancient writers mention a work with a similar, yet different, title. The first of these is Eusebius. After speaking of the "Shepherd" of Hermas, the Apocalypse of Peter, and the Epistle of Barnabas, he adds: "the so-called 'Teachings of the Apostles'" (*τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι διδαχαί*).[5] Somewhat later Athanasius[6] mentions "the so-called Teaching of the Apostles" (*Διδαχὴ καλουμένη τῶν ἀποστόλων*), along with other uncanonical works, such as the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit, and the "Shepherd." Twenty years after Athanasius, Rufinus[7] substantially repeats his state-

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 182; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 175; Reuss, *Hist. du Canon*, p. 48 f.

[2] *Vis.* ii. 3; cf. Numbers xi. 26 f., Sept. Vers.

[3] The complete edition of this work had been published some years earlier, so that we now deal with the Didache for the first time.

[4] Charles Bigg, D.D., *The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*, 1898, p. 21.

[5] *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 25. [6] *Ep. Fest.*, 39. [7] *Comm. in Symb. Apost.*, § 38.

ments; but, in regard to the apocrypha of the New Testament, for the so-called "Teaching of the Apostles" he substitutes "that which is called 'The Two Ways, or Judgment of Peter'" (*qui appellatur Duæ Viæ vel Judicium Petri*). We shall have more to say presently regarding this work. Our tract bears the title of "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" (Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων), and this is confirmed and enlarged by a sub-title: "The Teaching of the Lord, by the Twelve Apostles, to the Gentiles" (Διδαχὴ κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). Dr. Lightfoot and many other writers prefer to call it simply "The Teaching of the Apostles," in spite of this double heading, because that "is the designation in several ancient writers who refer to it,"[1] thus calmly assuming the identity of the two works; but we must protest against so unwarrantable an alteration of the title of a MS. to make it more closely agree with supposed references in the Fathers, for which no other justification is advanced.

In connection with this, we may point out that we have some very instructive testimony concerning the "Teaching of the Apostles" to which probably Eusebius and Athanasius refer in the Stichometry of Nicephorus. He gives a list of apocryphal books, amongst which he mentions the "Teaching of the Apostles" as containing 200 lines (στίχοι). Does this at all confirm the supposed application of these references to our "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" in its present form? Unfortunately it does not, but quite the contrary, for Harnack has calculated that our little work extends to 300 στίχοι.[2] It could not, therefore, as we now have it, have been the "Teaching of the Apostles" to which reference has been made.

It may be well here to refer to the contents of our Didache. It commences with a dissertation on the "Two Ways." "There are two ways—one of life and one of death, and there is a great difference between the two ways." This text is expounded throughout the first six divisions of the work; the sixth, however, being very brief, and evidently added to lead up to the remainder of the "Teaching," which deals (vii.–x.) with Baptism, Fasting, Prayer, and the Eucharist; whilst the third (xi.–xvi.) is devoted to later orders in the Church—apostles, prophets, bishops, and deacons—and lays down rules for their conduct and treatment. The first theme of the "Two Ways" has evidently been suggested by Jeremiah xxi. 8: "Behold, I set before you the way of life and the way of death"; which may also be connected with Deut. xxx. 19: "I have set before you life and death, blessing and

[1] Lightfoot, *The Apost. Fathers*, 1898, p. 215.
[2] Harnack, *Die Apostellehre*, 1886, p. 35, ed. of 1896, p. 41 f.

cursing; therefore choose life." The same texts are very probably the basis of the saying in Matt. vii. 13, 14; which shows how much the idea had influenced thought amongst the Jews. The "Teaching" is written, or rather adapted, by the compiler himself, and no attempt is made to connect it with the Apostles; whilst the section i. 3–6 is manifestly of a much later date than the rest of the dissertation on the "Two Ways," and consists of reminiscences of the "Sermon on the Mount" introduced by the compiler. With that exception, probably the whole of the first and second divisions (i.–vi., vii. x.) are of Jewish origin.[1] Dr. Lightfoot says of our little treatise: "The manual consists of two parts: (1) a moral treatise founded on an ancient work called 'The Two Ways,' and setting forth the paths of righteousness and unrighteousness, of life and death, respectively. This first part is not necessarily altogether of Christian origin; indeed, there is reason to believe that some portions of it were known to the Jews, and perhaps also to the Greeks, though it has undoubtedly gathered by accretions."[2] It is interesting to note, however, that, notwithstanding the Hebraistic character of the ancient work embodied in the "Teaching," the compiler represents a time when a complete breach between Jew and Christian had been accomplished in the Church. The Jews to him are simply "the hypocrites"[3] (viii. 1): "Let not your fastings be with the hypocrites"; "Neither pray ye as the hypocrites"; and, still more strongly to point his meaning and mark the difference between Jew and Christian, the fasts kept by the former on the second and fifth days of the week are to be abandoned, and kept by Christians on the fourth and sixth days.

But the substance of the treatise on the "Two Ways" is far from being confined to the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." It is also found more or less fully set forth in the Epistle of Barnabas, and the "Shepherd" of Hermas, and a large part of the critical battle regarding the date of our Didache has been fought round the connection of the three works to each other; one section of critics asserting the priority of the "Teaching," another the dependence of the tract on the Epistle and the "Shepherd," and a third maintaining that all three drew their material from an earlier work, whilst a fourth dates the "Teaching" very much later and

[1] Dr. Taylor gives interesting illustrations of this by comparison with the Talmud and Talmudic writings (*The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, 1886). Mr. Rendel Harris even says: "The teaching is Hebraistic from cover to cover" (*The Teaching of the Apostles*, 1887, p. 78).

[2] *Apost. Fathers*, p. 215. The idea of the "Two Ways" is found in classical works as early as Hesiod (*Op. et Dies*, 285). It is used in "The Choice of Hercules," which is usually ascribed to Prodicus the Sophist (Zenophont. *Mem.*, ii. 1–21).

[3] Harnack, *Chron. altchristl. Lit.*, 1897, i., p. 428.

considers that the author derived his matter from works of the third or fourth century. But the subject of the "Two Ways" is not limited to these writings, but is found embodied in much later works. In 1843, Bickell[1] published a Greek tract from a Vienna MS. which is generally known as the "Ecclesiastical Canons," or the Epitome of the Holy Apostles. Hilgenfeld conjectures this tract to be the work referred to by Rufinus under the name of "*Duæ Viæ vel Judicium Petri*," and in this he is supported by many able scholars. In this work, which contains a large part of the "Two Ways" as it exists in our "Teaching" and in the "Epistle of Barnabas," the doctrine is divided into twelve parts, each of which is put into the mouth of an apostle, the opening being enunciated by John in identically the same words as our Didache. This tract is generally dated at least in the third century. In the same way the dissertation on the "Two Ways" is practically embodied in the seventh book of the Apostolic Constitutions, which is usually assigned to a still later date. In the Epistle of Barnabas, the "Shepherd" of Hermas, the Epitome and the Apostolic Constitutions, therefore, nearly the whole treatise of the "Two Ways" is included, and the only question is as to the chronological order of these various forms of the doctrine. That our Didache was not the original source, as we have already pointed out, is certain, and it may, on the other hand, have been the last, collecting from the foregoing what may have seemed to the compiler the most striking passages.

This is not all, however, for in 1884, after the publication of our Didache by Bryennius, von Gebhardt brought to light the short fragment of a Latin translation of the "Two Ways," with which he had met some years before, and which approximates to the form of our "Teaching," with the important difference that it omits all the references to the Sermon on the Mount, which, taken in connection with the similar omission elsewhere,[2] are thus shown to be the later amplification of the compiler.

Not only is it maintained by many that, in spite of its different title, our Didache is the work referred to by Eusebius and Athanasius, but it is asserted to be the work from which Clement of Alexandria quoted as "Scripture." Clement says: "Such an

[1] Gesch. d. Kirchenrechts, 1843. It bears the title *Αἱ διαταγαὶ αἱ διὰ Κλήμεντος καὶ κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων*. Cardinal Pitra found the same tract in a MS. in the Ottobonian library bearing the title *Ἐπιτομὴ ὅρων τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καθολικῆς παραδόσεως*. It is also given by Hilgenfeld in his *N. T. extra Can. Recept.*, 1884, Fasc. iv. Codices in Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic have since been discovered.

[2] Lactantius, *Epit. div. Instit.*, c. lix, for instance, and in writings of pseudo-Athanasius, but still more markedly in the Epistle of Barnabas, the writer of which could have no reason for omitting them if they had stood in the original treatise of which he made use.

one is called a thief by the Scripture; at least, it says, 'Son (Υἱὲ), become not a liar, for (γὰρ) lying leads to (πρὸς) theft.'" In the "Teaching" these words occur (iii. 5): "My child (Τέκνον μου), become not a liar, since (ἐπειδὴ) lying leads to (εἰς) theft." Now, it is remarkable that the quotation in Clement begins with "Son"; but if there be anything more characteristic of the Didache than another, it is the use of the phrase "My child" as the precursor of such admonitions. In the first six chapters, devoted to the "Two Ways," it is used six times, and "Son" is never introduced. No one reading this form of the "Two Ways," and even quoting from memory, would be in the least likely to couple with these admonitions any other style of address, and when we bear in mind the numerous works in which the ancient text of the "Two Ways" has been incorporated, of which we have already mentioned five, it is evidently extremely hazardous to affirm that the few works used by Clement identify this particular tract. The phrase, in fact, is found in the Epitome (ii.), "Child, become not a liar, since lying leads unto (ἐπὶ) theft," which may, with equal reason, be identified as the source of Clement's quotation.

No work has recently received more keen attention from critics of all schools than the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," and few have excited deeper interest or received more divergent judgments. Whilst many have pronounced it to be one of the earliest Christian writings extant, emanating even from about the middle of the first century, others have assigned it to the fourth century.[1]

[1] Middle of the first century—Sabatier *La Didachè*, 1885, p. 159.

Second half first century—Bestmann, *Gesch. christl. Sitte*, 1885, ii., p. 136 ff.; Jacquier, *La Doctrine d. douze Ap.*, 1891, p. 97; Majocchi, *La Dottrina dei dod. Ap.*, 1886, p. 71; Petersen, *Lehre d. zwölf Ap.*, 1884, p. 12; H. de Romestin, *Teaching of Twelve Aps.*, 1884, p. 6, 1885 Pref. 2nd ed.; Spence, *Teaching of the Aps.*, 1885, p. 98; Wünsche, *Lehre d. zw. Ap.*, 1884, p. 6.

End first century or beginning of second—Binnie, *Br. and Foreign Ev. Rev.*, Oct., 1885, p. 640 ff.; Farrar, *Contemp. Rev.*, 1884, p. 698 ff.; *Expositor*, 1884, p. 380 ff.; Funk, *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1884, p. 401; *Doctrina duodecim Apost.*, 1887, p. xxxii.; Heron, *Church of Sub-ap. Age*, 1888, p. 83; Hitchcock and Brown, *Teaching of Twelve Aps.*, 1885, p. xc. f. Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, 1898, p. 216; *Expositor*, 1885, p. 6; Lechler, *Urkundenfunde Gesch. christl. Altertums*, 1886, p. 75; Massebieau, *L'Enseignement des douze Ap.*, 1884, p. 35; E. von Renesse, *Die Lehre zwölf Ap.*, 1897, p. 85; Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, 1885, p. 119 ff.; Taylor, *Teaching Twelve Aps.*, 1886, p. 118; Venables, *Brit. Quarterly Rev.*, 1885, p. 333 ff.; Warfield, *Bibl. Sacra*, 1886, p. 100 ff.; Wordsworth, *Guardian*, Mar. 19th, 1884; Zahn, *Theol. Literaturblatt*, June 27th, July 11th, 1884; *Forsch. Gesch. N. T. Kanons*, 1884, iii., p. 318 f.

First half second century—Baltzer, *Wiedergef. Zwolfapostellehre*, 1886, p. 13. A.D. 110–130 Robinson, *Encyclop. Bibl.*, 1899, i., p. 676. A.D. 120 too

It only remains for us now briefly to examine the supposed references to our Gospels in the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." The compiler does not in the least endeavour to associate the Apostles directly with his dissertation, nor does he even mention the name of any one of them. He does not, of course, indicate the title of any work in the New Testament. For him, apparently, the Old Testament books are the only holy "Scripture," and to these he twice refers. Harnack has counted some twenty-three Gospel expressions which are considered more or less like some in our Synoptics; but of these seventeen are said more nearly to approximate to passages in Matthew, and he regards one of these at least as a mixture of the first and third of our Gospels, though he is in doubt whether the compiler may not have used Tatian's *Diatessaron*, or even the Gospel of Peter.[1] All of these passages are more or less near coincidences with expressions in the "Sermon on the Mount," and it is argued that it is not possible they could be derived from oral tradition, and that consequently they indicate a "written Gospel." As these expressions have closer similarity to our first Synoptic than to any of the others, it is at once claimed by eager critics that they prove the use of that Gospel. A circumstance which, in most cases, strengthens this view is the fact that in several instances these expressions are said by the writer to come "in the Gospel." This form occurs in the following cases (viii. 2): "As the Lord commanded in his Gospel" (ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ); xi. 3: "But regarding the apostles and prophets, according to the decree of the Gospel (κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὕτως), so do ye"; xv. 3: "But reprove one another, not in anger, but in peace, as ye find in the Gospel" (ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ); and in xv. 4: "But your prayers and alms and all your deeds do as ye find in the Gospel of our Lord" (ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν). We may simply make the remark that only in the first of these—which we shall presently

early, A.D. 160, too late for parts, Gordon, *Modern Rev.*, 1884, p. 457. A.D. 133–135 Volkmar, *Die Lehre d. z. Ap.*, 1885, p. 44.

Later than A.D. 130–140—Van Manen, *Encyclop. Bibl.*, iii., 1902, p. 3,484. A.D. 131–160, Harnack, *Chronol. altchristl. Lit.*, 1897, i., p. 438; *Die Apostellehre*, 1896, p. 20 f.; Bryennius, Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων, 1883, p. 20. After middle of second century, Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1885, p. 100. A.D. 140–165, Lipsius, *Lit. Centralblatt*, Jan., 1885, cf. *Deutsche Literaturzeit.*, 1884, p. 1,449 ff. Before A.D. 140–Addis, *Dublin Rev.*, Oct., 1884, p. 442 ff. A.D. 140–165, Meyboom, *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1885, p. 628 ff. A.D. 160–190 Bonet-Maury, *La Doctrine des douze Ap.*, 1884, p. 34 ff. A.D. 200 Krawutzcky, *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1884, p. 585 ff.

Fourth century—Bigg, *Doctrine of Twelve Ap.*, 1898, p. 23; Cotterill, *Scottish Church Rev.* 1884, July and Sept.; Hoole, *The Didache*, 1894, p. 45 f.; Long, *Baptist Quarterly*, 1884, July and September.

[1] Harnack, *Die Apostellehre*, 1896, p. 8 ff.

discuss—is there any direct reference to any passage resembling our Gospels; though the last, with its admonition regarding prayers, alms, and actions, may be taken as a general reference to the teaching of Jesus. Now, though no one would maintain that, at the time when this Didache was compiled, there was no written "Gospel," too much stress must not be laid upon these expressions. It is certain that, to the majority of Christians in early times, oral tradition must have been the means of rendering familiar the more remarkable sayings of Jesus much more than written documents, which could only be in limited circulation, and to the mass of these converts his teaching must therefore have been more a spoken than a written Gospel. If we look in the New Testament itself, we find similar words used, which no one will assert to refer to a written Gospel. For instance (Matt. iv. 23): "And he went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the kingdom" (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας); cf. ix. 35, xxvi. 13. In Mark viii. 35 there is a similar expression: "Whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the Gospel's (καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) will save it." In 1 Cor. iv. 15, again, we read: "For in Christ Jesus I begot you through the Gospel" (διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου)—cf. ix. 14; and in Gal. ii. 2: "And communicated to them the Gospel [τὸ εὐαγγέλιον] which I preach among the Gentiles."

We may now consider the first of the above passages, which contains the principal of the supposed references. Matt. viii. 2: "Neither pray ye as the hypocrites, but as the Lord commanded in his Gospel, thus pray ye"; and then follows what is known as the Lord's Prayer. The prayer is given as it appears in our first Synoptic (vi. 9–13), but with some noteworthy alterations. "Our Father which art in heaven" (ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ) is used instead of "in the heavens" (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς); and "forgive us our debt" (τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἡμῶν) instead of "our debts" (τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν). A still more important divergence occurs in the doxology, which in the Didache is given: "For thine is the power, and the glory for ever," omitting both "the kingdom" and the final "amen."[1] Of course, it may be noted that the oldest and best texts of Matt. vi. 13 omit the doxology altogether, and it has now disappeared even from the Revised Version; but the variation we point out makes the Didache differ even from the Codices which contain it. That the omission of "kingdom" is not accidental is proved by the fact that the very same peculiar doxology is again used in the "Teaching" in connection with another prayer (x. 5). Probably no part of the so-called Sermon on the Mount was more

[1] We do not mention the substitution of ἐλθέτω for ἐλθάτω and ἀφίεμεν for ἀφήκαμεν, for this is supported by some of our oldest texts.

spread abroad in oral tradition than this prayer, and to suppose that this faulty agreement is evidence of the use specially of the first Synoptic is not permissible.

The same remark applies to all the reminiscences of the "Sermon" in this tract, and we do not consider it necessary further to examine them here. Nothing is more remarkable than the habit, even of able critics when examining supposed quotations in early writings, boldly to ascribe them to our Synoptics, however much they differ from our texts, in total forgetfulness of the fact that many records of doings and sayings of Jesus, which are no longer extant, existed before our Gospels were composed, and circulated with them. Many of these, subsequently absorbed by our Gospels, or displaced by them, undoubtedly contained the best passages in the teaching of Jesus in very similar shape, and were long very widely read. More especially does this remark apply to reminiscences of the "Sermon on the Mount," to which the expressions in the Didache are confined. We have even in our first and third Synoptics an illustration of this statement. In the first Gospel we have the "Sermon on the Mount" with all these passages joined together in one long discourse. In the third Synoptic we find no "Sermon on the Mount" at all, but part of that long discourse is given as a "Sermon on the Plain," whilst other portions are scattered throughout the Gospel. In the second Synoptic we have neither a "Sermon on the Mount" nor on the plain, but many fragments are separately introduced. In all three the various passages are put in a context which is often contradictory of each other. Who can doubt that the *Logia* and the documents which lie behind the three Synoptics contained them in one shape or another, and that it is impossible to claim the use in any ancient work of such sayings from unnamed sources as proof of the existence of any particular Gospel?

There is one further passage to which we may refer. In his first chapter, § 6, the compiler of our Didache says: "But regarding this it is also said: 'Let thine alms sweat into thy hands until thou knowest to whom to give.'"[1] This saying, which is quoted in some way as Scripture, "it is also said" (*εἴρηται*), is not found in our Synoptics, and is referred to an apocryphal Gospel. It is in immediate sequence to admonitions, in which are incorporated reminiscences of the "Sermon on the Mount," which wind up with words like those in Matt. v. 26, "He shall not come out thence till he hath given back the last farthing." Then at once follow the words just discussed. If these words were "also said" in the work in which the expression like Matt. v. 26 was

[1] *ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τούτου δὲ ἔιρηται· ἱδρωτάτω ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου μέχρις ἂν γνῷς τίνι δῷς.*

found, why should all the reminiscences from the "Sermon on the Mount" not have been derived from the same apocryphal source?

We have, however, devoted more space to this little book than may seem necessary, for in so far as our particular purpose is concerned a decision is perfectly certain and easy. The "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" is anonymous, and nothing is either known or surmised as to its compiler. He does not mention any of the Apostles, and gives no indication whatever of the writer of any work in our New Testament. He does not afford the slightest evidence, therefore, even of the existence of any of our Gospels, and in no way bears testimony to their credibility as witnesses for miracles and the reality of Divine revelation.

CHAPTER II.

THE EPISTLES OF IGNATIUS—THE EPISTLE OF POLYCARP

ALTHOUGH in reality appertaining to a very much later period, we shall here refer to the so-called "Epistles of Ignatius," and examine any testimony which they afford regarding the date and authenticity of our Gospels. There are in all fifteen Epistles bearing the name of Ignatius; three of these, addressed to the Virgin Mary and the Apostle John (2), exist only in a Latin version, and these, together with five others directed to Mary of Cassobola, to the Tarsians, to the Antiochans, to Hero of Antioch, and to the Philippians, of which there are versions both in Greek and Latin, are universally admitted to be spurious, and may, so far as their contents are concerned, be at once dismissed from all consideration. They are not mentioned by Eusebius, nor does any early writer refer to them. Of the remaining seven Epistles, addressed to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphians, Smyrnæans, and to Polycarp, there are two distinct versions extant: one long version, of which there are both Greek and Latin texts; and another much shorter, and presenting considerable variations, of which there are also both Greek and Latin texts. After a couple of centuries of discussion, critics, almost without exception, have finally agreed that the longer version is nothing more than an interpolated version of the shorter and more ancient form of the Epistles. The question regarding the authenticity of the Ignatian Epistles, however, was re-opened and complicated by the publication in 1845, by Dr. Cureton, of a Syriac version of three Epistles only—to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans—in a still shorter form, discovered amongst a large number of MSS. purchased by Dr. Tattam from the monks of the Desert of Nitria. These three Syriac Epistles have been subjected to the severest scrutiny, and many of the ablest critics have pronounced them to be the only authentic Epistles of Ignatius, whilst others, who do not admit that even these are genuine letters emanating from Ignatius, still prefer them to the version of seven Greek Epistles, and consider them the most ancient form of the letters which we possess. As early as the sixteenth century, however, the strongest doubts were expressed regarding the authenticity of any of the Epistles ascribed to Ignatius. The Magdeburg Centuriators first attacked them, and Calvin declared them to be spurious, an

opinion fully shared by Daillé and others; Chemnitz regarded them with suspicion; and similar doubts, more or less definite, were expressed throughout the seventeenth century, and onward to comparatively recent times, although the means of forming a judgment were not then so complete as now. That the Epistles were interpolated there was no doubt. Fuller examination and more comprehensive knowledge of the subject have confirmed earlier doubts, and a large mass of critics has either recognised that the authenticity of none of these Epistles can be established, or that they can only be considered later and spurious compositions.

Omitting for the present the so-called Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, the earliest reference to any of these Epistles, or to Ignatius himself, is made by Irenæus, who quotes a passage which is found in the Epistle to the Romans (ch. iv.), without, however, any mention of name, introduced by the following words: "As a certain man of ours said, being condemned to the wild beasts on account of his testimony to God: 'I am the wheat of God, and by the teeth of beasts I am ground, that I may be found pure bread.'"[1] Origen likewise quotes two brief sentences which he refers to Ignatius. The first is merely: "But my love is crucified,"[2] which is likewise found in the Epistle to the Romans (ch. vii.); and the other quoted as "out of one of the Epistles" of the martyr Ignatius: "From the Prince of this world was concealed the virginity of Mary,"[3] which is found in the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. xix.). Eusebius mentions seven Epistles,[4] and quotes one passage from the Epistle to the Romans (ch. v.), and a few words from an apocryphal Gospel contained in the Epistle to the Smyrnæans (ch. iii.), the source of which he says that he does not know, and he cites from Irenæus the brief quotation given above, and refers to the mention of the Epistles in the letter of Polycarp, which we reserve. Elsewhere[5] he further quotes a short sentence found in the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. xix.), part of which had previously been cited by Origen. It will be observed that all these quotations, with the exception of that from Irenæus, are taken from the three Epistles which exist in the Syriac translation, and they are found in that version; and the first occasion on which any passage attributed to Ignatius is quoted which is not in the Syriac version of the three Epistles occurs in the second half of the fourth century, when Athanasius, in his

[1] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, v. 28, § 4; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 36. Lardner expresses a doubt whether this is a quotation at all.

[2] *Prolog.* in *Cantic. Canticor.*

[3] *Hom.* vi. in Lucam. [4] *H. E.*, iii. 36.

[5] *Quæst. ad Steph.*; cf. Cureton, *Corp. Ign.*, p. 164.

Epistle regarding the Synods of Ariminum and Selucia,[1] quotes a few words from the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. vii.); but, although foreign to the Syriac text, it is to be noted that the words are at least from a form of one of the three Epistles which exist in that version. It is a fact, therefore, that up to the second half of the fourth century no quotation ascribed to Ignatius, except one by Eusebius, exists, which is not found in the three short Syriac letters.

As we have already remarked, the Syriac version of the three Epistles is very much shorter than the shorter Greek version; the Epistle to the Ephesians, for instance, being only about one-third of the length of the Greek text. Those who still maintain the superior authenticity of the Greek shorter version argue that the Syriac is an epitome of the Greek. This does not, however, seem tenable when the matter is carefully examined. Although so much is absent from the Syriac version, not only is there no interruption of the sense, and no obscurity or undue curtness in the style, but the Epistles read more consecutively, without faults of construction or grammar; and passages which in the Greek text were confused, and almost unintelligible, have become quite clear in the Syriac. The interpolations of the text, in fact, had been so clumsily made that they had obscured the meaning, and their mere omission, without any other alteration of grammatical construction, has restored the epistles to clear and simple order. It is, moreover, a remarkable fact that the passages which, long before the discovery of the Syriac epistles, were pointed out as chiefly determining that the epistles were spurious, are not found in the Syriac version at all. Archbishop Usher, who only admitted the authenticity of six epistles, showed that much interpolation of these letters took place in the sixth century;[2] but this very fact increases the probability of much earlier interpolation also, to which the various existing versions most clearly point. The interpolations can be explained upon the most palpable dogmatic grounds, but not so the omissions upon the hypothesis that the Syriac version is an abridgment made upon any distinct dogmatic principle, for that which is allowed to remain renders the omissions ineffectual for dogmatic reasons. There is no ground of interest, therefore, upon which the portions omitted and retained by the Syriac version can be intelligently explained. Finally, here, we may mention that the MSS. of the three Syriac epistles are more ancient by some centuries than those of any of the Greek versions of the Seven epistles.[3] The strongest internal as well as other evidence, into which space forbids our going in

[1] *Opera, Bened. ed.*, i., p. 761.
[2] *Dissert.*, ch. vi., p. xxxiii. [3] Cureton, *The Anc. Syr. Vers.*, p. xl.

detail, has led the majority of critics to recognise the Syriac version as the most ancient form of the letters of Ignatius extant, and this is admitted by many of those who nevertheless deny the authenticity of any of the epistles.[1]

Seven Epistles have been selected out of fifteen extant, all equally purporting to be by Ignatius, simply because only that number was mentioned by Eusebius, from whom, for the first time in the fourth century, except the general reference in the so-called Epistle of Polycarp, to which we shall presently refer, we hear of them. Now, neither the silence of Eusebius regarding the eight Epistles, nor his mention of the seven, can have much weight in deciding the question of their authenticity. The only point which is settled by the reference of Eusebius is that, at the date at which he wrote, seven Epistles were known to him which were ascribed to Ignatius. He evidently knew little or nothing regarding the man or the Epistles beyond what he had learnt from themselves, and he mentions the martyr-journey to Rome as a mere report: "It is said that he was conducted from Syria to Rome to be cast to wild beasts on account of his testimony to Christ."[2] It would be unreasonable to argue that no other Epistles existed simply because Eusebius did not mention them; and, on the other hand, it would be still more unreasonable to affirm that the seven Epistles are authentic merely because Eusebius, in the fourth century—that is to say, some two centuries after they are supposed to have been written—had met with them. Does anyone believe the letter of Jesus to Abgarus, Prince of Edessa, to be genuine because Eusebius inserts it in his history[3] as an authentic document out of the public records of the city of Edessa? There is, in fact, no evidence that the brief quotations of Irenæus and Origen are taken from either of the extant Greek versions of the Epistles; for, as we have mentioned, they exist in the Syriac Epistles, and there is nothing to show the original state of the letters from which they were derived. Nothing is more certain than the fact that, if any writer wished to circulate letters in the name of Ignatius, he would insert such passages as were said to have been quoted from genuine Epistles of Ignatius, and, supposing those quotations to be real, all that could be inferred on finding such passages would be that, at least, so much might be genuine. It is a total mistake to suppose that the seven Epistles mentioned by Eusebius have been transmitted to us in any special way. These Epistles are mixed up in the Medicean and corresponding ancient Latin

[1] Regarding the Armenian version, see Preface to 6th ed., p. xliv. ff.

[2] Λόγος δ' ἔχει τοῦτον ἀπὸ Συρίας ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν, κ.τ.λ., *H. E.*, iii. 36.

[3] *H. E.*, i. 13.

MSS. with the other eight Epistles, universally announced to be spurious, without distinction of any kind, and all have equal honour. The recognition of the number seven may, therefore, be ascribed simply to the reference to them by Eusebius, and his silence regarding the rest.

What, then, is the position of the so-called Ignatian Epistles? Towards the end of the second century, Irenæus makes a very short quotation from a source unnamed, which Eusebius, in the fourth century, finds in an Epistle attributed to Ignatius. Origen, in the third century, quotes a very few words, which he ascribes to Ignatius, although without definite reference to any particular Epistle; and in the fourth century Eusebius mentions seven Epistles ascribed to Ignatius. There is no other evidence. There are, however, fifteen Epistles extant attributed to Ignatius, of all of which, with the exception of three which are only known in a Latin version, we possess both Greek and Latin versions. Of seven of these Epistles—and they are those mentioned by Eusebius—we have two Greek versions, one of which is very much shorter than the other; and, finally, we now possess a Syriac version of three Epistles only, in a form still shorter than the shorter Greek version, in which are found all the quotations of the Fathers, without exception, up to the fourth century. Eight of the fifteen Epistles are universally rejected as spurious. The longer Greek version of the remaining seven Epistles is almost unanimously condemned as grossly interpolated; and the majority of critics recognise that the shorter Greek version is also much interpolated; whilst the Syriac version, which so far as MSS. are concerned is by far the most ancient text of any of the letters which we possess, reduces their number to three, and their contents to a very small compass. It is not surprising that the majority of critics have expressed doubt more or less strong regarding the authenticity of all of these Epistles, and that so large a number have repudiated them altogether. One thing is quite evident, that amidst such a mass of falsification, interpolation, and fraud, the Ignatian Epistles cannot, in any form, be considered evidence on any important point.

These doubts, however, have been intensified by consideration of the circumstances under which the Ignatian Epistles are represented as having been composed. They profess to have been written by Ignatius during his journey from Antioch to Rome, in the custody of Roman soldiers, in order to be exposed to wild beasts, the form of martyrdom to which he had been condemned. The writer describes the circumstances of his journey as follows: "From Syria even unto Rome I fight with wild beasts, by sea and by land, by night and day; being bound amongst ten leopards, which are the band of soldiers, who, even receiving benefits,

become worse."[1] Now, if this account be in the least degree true, how is it possible to suppose that the martyr could have found means to write so many long Epistles, entering minutely into dogmatic teaching, and expressing the most deliberate and advanced views regarding ecclesiastical government? Indeed, it may be asked why Ignatius should have considered it necessary in such a journey, even if the possibility be for a moment conceded, to address such Epistles to communities and individuals to whom, by the showing of the letters themselves, he had just had opportunities of addressing his counsels in person. The Epistles themselves bear none of the marks of composition under such circumstances, and it is impossible to suppose that soldiers, such as the quotation above describes, would allow a prisoner, condemned to wild beasts for professing Christianity, deliberately to write long Epistles at every stage of his journey, promulgating the very doctrines for which he was condemned. And not only this, but on his way to martyrdom, he has, according to the Epistles,[2] perfect freedom to see his friends. He receives the bishops, deacons, and members of various Christian communities, who come with greetings to him, and devoted followers accompany him on his journey. All this without hindrance from the "ten leopards," of whose cruelty he complains, and without persecution or harm to those who so openly declare themselves his friends and fellow-believers. The whole story is absolutely incredible.

Against these objections Dr. Lightfoot advances arguments, derived from Zahn, regarding the Roman procedure in cases that are said to be "known." These cases, however, are neither analogous nor have they the force which is assumed. That Christians imprisoned for their religious belief should receive their nourishment, while in prison, from friends, is anything but extraordinary, and that bribes should secure access to them in many cases, and some mitigation of suffering, is possible. The case of Ignatius, however, is very different. If the meaning of *οἱ καὶ εὐεργετούμενοι χείρους γίνονται* be that, although receiving bribes, the "ten leopards" only became more cruel, the very reverse of the leniency and mild treatment ascribed to the Roman procedure is described by the writer himself as actually taking place, and certainly nothing approaching a parallel to the correspondence of pseudo-Ignatius can be pointed out in any known instance. The case of Saturus and Perpetua, even if true, is no confirmation, the

[1] *Ἀπὸ Συρίας μέχρι Ῥώμης θηριομαχῶ διὰ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, ἐνδεδεμένος δέκα λεοπάρδοις, ὅ ἐστιν στρατιωτικὸν τάγμα· οἱ καὶ εὐεργετούμενοι χείρους γίνονται.* *Ep. Ad. Rom.*, v.

[2] Cf. *ad Ephes.*, i. ii., *ad Magnes.* ii. xv., *ad Trall.* i., *ad Rom.* x., *ad Philadelph.* xi., *ad Smyrn.* x. xiii., etc.

circumstances being very different;[1] but, in fact, there is no evidence whatever that the extant history was written by either of them,[2] but, on the contrary, every reason to believe that it was not.

Dr. Lightfoot advances the instance of Paul as a case in point of a Christian prisoner treated with great consideration, and who "writes letters freely, receives visits from his friends, communicates with churches and individuals as he desires."[3] It is scarcely possible to imagine two cases more dissimilar than those of pseudo-Ignatius and Paul, as narrated in the "Acts of the Apostles," although doubtless the story of the former has been framed upon some of the lines of the latter. Whilst Ignatius is condemned to be cast to the wild beasts as a Christian, Paul is not condemned at all, but stands in the position of a Roman citizen, rescued from infuriated Jews (xxiii. 27), repeatedly declared by his judges to have done nothing worthy of death or of bonds (xxv. 25, xxvi. 31), and who might have been set at liberty but that he had appealed to Cæsar (xxv. 11 f., xxvi. 32). His position was one which secured the sympathy of the Roman soldiers. Ignatius "fights with beasts from Syria even unto Rome," and is cruelly treated by his "ten leopards"; but Paul is represented as receiving very different treatment. Felix commands that his own people should be allowed to come and minister to him (xxiv. 23), and when the voyage is commenced it is said that Julius, who had charge of Paul, treated him courteously, and gave him liberty to go to see his friends at Sidon (xxvii. 3). At Rome he was allowed to live by himself with a single soldier to guard him (xxviii. 16), and he continued for two years in his own hired house (xxviii. 28). These circumstances are totally different from those under which the Epistles of Ignatius are said to have been written.

"But the most powerful testimony," Dr. Lightfoot goes on to say, "is derived from the representations of a heathen writer."[4] The case of Peregrinus, to which he refers, seems to us even more unfortunate than that of Paul. Of Peregrinus himself, historically, we really know little or nothing, for the account of Lucian is scarcely received by anyone as serious. Lucian narrates that this Peregrinus Proteus, a cynic philosopher, having been guilty of parricide and other crimes, found it convenient to leave his own country. In the course of his travels he fell in with Christians and learnt their doctrines, and, according to Lucian, the Christians soon were mere children in his hands, so that he became in his own person "prophet, high priest, and ruler of a synagogue";

[1] Ruinart, *Acta Mart.*, p. 137 ff.; cf. Baronius, *Mart. Rom.*, 1631, p. 152.
[2] Cf. Lardner, *Credibility*, etc., Works, iii., p. 3.
[3] *Contemporary Review*, February, 1875, p. 349.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 350.

and, further, "they spoke of him as a god, used him as a law-giver, and elected him as their chief man."[1] After a time he was put in prison for his new faith, which, Lucian says, was a real service to him afterwards in his impostures. During the time he was in prison he is said to have received those services from Christians which Dr. Lightfoot quotes. Peregrinus was subsequently set at liberty by the Governor of Syria, who loved philosophy,[2] and travelled about, living in great comfort at the expense of the Christians, until at last they quarrelled, in consequence, Lucian thinks, of his eating some forbidden food. Finally, Peregrinus ended his career by throwing himself into the flames of a funeral pile during the Olympian games. An earthquake is said to have taken place at the time; a vulture flew out from the pile, crying out with a human voice; and shortly after Peregrinus rose again, and appeared clothed in white raiment, unhurt by the fire.

Now, this writing, of which we have given the barest sketch, is a direct satire upon Christians, or even, as Baur affirms, "a parody of the history of Jesus."[3] There are no means of ascertaining that any of the events of the Christian career of Peregrinus were true; but it is obvious that Lucian's policy was to exaggerate the facility of access to prisoners, as well as the assiduity and attention of the Christians to Peregrinus, the ease with which they were duped being the chief point of the satire.

There is another circumstance which must be mentioned. Lucian's account of Peregrinus is claimed by supporters of the Ignatian Epistles as evidence for them.[4] "The singular correspondence in this narrative with the account of Ignatius, combined with some striking coincidences of expression," they argue, show "that Lucian was acquainted with the Ignatian history, if not with the Ignatian letters." These are the words of Dr. Lightfoot, although he guards himself, in referring to this argument, by the words, "if it be true," and does not express his own opinion; but he goes on to say: "At all events it is conclusive for the matter in hand, as showing that Christian prisoners were treated in the very way described in these Epistles."[5] On the contrary, it is in no case conclusive of anything. If it were true that Lucian employed, as the basis of his satire, the Ignatian Epistles and Martyrology, it is clear that his narrative cannot be used as independent testimony for the truth of the statements regarding the treatment of Christian prisoners. On the other hand, as this cannot be shown, his story remains a mere satire, with very little

[1] *De Morte Peregr.*, 11. [2] *Ib.*, 14.
[3] *Gesch. chr. Kirche*, i., p. 410 f.
[4] See, for instance, Denzinger, *Ueber die Aechtheit d. bish. Textes d. Ignat. Briefe*, 1849, p. 87 ff.; Zahn, *Ignatius v. Ant.*, 1873, p. 517 ff.
[5] *Contemporary Review*, February, 1875, p. 350 f.

historical value. Apart from all this, however, the case of Peregrinus, a man confined in prison for a short time, under a favourable governor, and not pursued with any severity, is no parallel to that of Ignatius, condemned *ad bestias*, and, according to his own express statement, cruelly treated by the "ten leopards"; and, further, the liberty of pseudo-Ignatius must greatly have exceeded all that is said of Peregrinus, if he was able to write such Epistles, and hold such free intercourse as they represent.

There seems to be good reason for believing that Ignatius was not sent to Rome at all, but suffered martyrdom in Antioch itself on the 20th December A.D. 115, being condemned to be cast to wild beasts in the amphitheatre, in consequence of the fanatical excitement produced by the earthquake which occurred on the 13th of that month. There are no less than three martyrologies of Ignatius giving an account of the martyr's supposed journey from Antioch to Rome, but these can have no weight, as they are all recognised to be mere idle legends, of whose existence we do not hear till a very late period.

We shall briefly state the case for holding that the martyrdom took place in Antioch, and not in Rome. The Ignatian Epistles and martyrologies set forth that, during a general persecution of Christians, in Syria at least, Ignatius was condemned by Trajan, when he wintered in Antioch during the Parthian War, to be taken to Rome and cast to wild beasts in the amphitheatre. When we inquire whether these facts are supported by historical data, the reply is emphatically adverse. All that is known of the treatment of Christians during the reign of Trajan, as well as of the character of the Emperor, is opposed to the supposition that Ignatius could have been condemned by Trajan himself, or even by a provincial governor, to be taken to Rome and there cast to the beasts. It is well known that, under Trajan, there was no general persecution of Christians, although there may have been instances in which prominent members of the body were either punished or fell victims to popular fury and superstition.[1] An instance of this kind was the martyrdom of Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, reported by Hegesippus. He was not condemned *ad bestias*, however, and much less deported to Rome for the purpose. Why should Ignatius have been so exceptionally treated? In fact, even during the persecutions under Marcus Aurelius, although Christians in Syria were frequently enough cast to the beasts, there is no instance recorded in which anyone condemned to this fate was sent to Rome. Such a sentence is

[1] Milman says: "Excepting of Ignatius, probably of Simeon of Jerusalem, there is no authentic martyrdom in the reign of Trajan."—*Hist. of Christianity*, 1867, ii., p. 103 note.

quite at variance with the clement character of Trajan and his principles of government. Neander, in a passage quoted by Baur, says: "As he (Trajan), like Pliny, considered Christianity mere fanaticism, he also probably thought that if severity were combined with clemency, if too much noise were not made about it, the open demonstration not left unpunished, but also minds not stirred up by persecution, fanatical enthusiasm would more easily cool down, and the matter by degrees come to an end."[1] This was certainly the policy which mainly characterised his reign. Now, not only would such a severe sentence have been contrary to such principles, but the agitation excited would have been enormously increased by sending the martyr a long journey by land through Asia, and allowing him to pass through some of the principal cities, hold constant intercourse with the various Christian communities, and address long epistles to them. With the fervid desire for martyrdom then prevalent, such a journey would have been a triumphal progress, spreading everywhere excitement and enthusiasm. It may not be out of place, as an indication of the results of impartial examination, to point out that Neander's inability to accept the Ignatian epistles largely rests on his disbelief of the whole tradition of this sentence and martyr-journey. "We do not recognise the Emperor Trajan in this narrative" (the martyrology), he says, "therefore cannot but doubt everything which is related by this document, as well as that, during this reign, Christians can have been cast to the wild beasts."[2]

If, for a moment, we suppose that, instead of being condemned by Trajan himself, Ignatius received his sentence from a provincial governor, the story does not gain greater probability. It is not credible that such an official would have ventured to act so much in opposition to the spirit of the Emperor's government. Besides, if such a governor did pronounce so severe a sentence, why did he not execute it in Antioch? Why send the prisoner to Rome? By doing so he made all the more conspicuous a severity which was not likely to be pleasing to the clement Trajan. The cruelty which dictated a condemnation *ad bestias* would have been more gratified by execution on the spot. The transport to Rome is in no case credible, and the utmost that can be admitted is that Ignatius, like Simeon of Jerusalem, may have been condemned to death during this reign, more especially if the event be associated with some sudden outbreak of superstitious fury against the Christians, to which the martyr may at once have fallen a victim. We are not without indications of such a cause operating in the case of Ignatius.

[1] *K. G.*, 1842, i., p. 171. [2] *Ib.*, p. 172 anm.

It is generally admitted that the date of Trajan's visit to Antioch is A.D. 115, when he wintered there during the Parthian war. An earthquake occurred on the 13th of December of that year, which was well calculated to excite popular superstition. It may not be out of place to quote here the account of the earthquake given by Dean Milman, who, although he mentions a different date, and adheres to the martyrdom in Rome, still associates the condemnation of Ignatius with the earthquake. He says: "Nevertheless, at that time there were circumstances which account with singular likelihood for that sudden outburst of persecution in Antioch..... At this very time an earthquake, more than usually terrible and destructive, shook the cities of the East. Antioch suffered its most appalling ravages—Antioch, crowded with the legionaries prepared for the Emperor's invasion of the East, with ambassadors and tributary kings from all parts of the East. The city shook through all its streets; houses, palaces, theatres, temples fell crashing down. Many were killed: the Consul Pedo died of his hurts. The Emperor himself hardly escaped through a window, and took refuge in the Circus, where he passed some days in the open air. Whence this terrible blow but from the wrath of the Gods, who must be appeased by unusual sacrifices? This was towards the end of January; early in February the Christian Bishop, Ignatius, was arrested. We know how, during this century, at every period of public calamity, whatever that calamity might be, the cry of the panic-stricken Heathens was, 'The Christians to the lions!' It may be that, in Trajan's humanity, in order to prevent a general massacre by the infuriated populace, or to give greater solemnity to the sacrifice, the execution was ordered to take place, not in Antioch, but in Rome."[1] These reasons, on the contrary, render execution in Antioch infinitely more probable. To continue, however: the earthquake occurred on the 13th, and the martyrdom of Ignatius took place on the 20th of December, just a week after the earthquake. His remains, as we know from Chrysostom and others, were interred at Antioch. The natural inference is that the martyrdom, the only part of the Ignatian story which is credible, occurred not in Rome, but in Antioch itself, in consequence of the superstitious fury against the ἄθεοι aroused by the earthquake.

We must now go more into the details of the brief statements just made, and here we come to John Malalas. In the first place he mentions the occurrence of the earthquake on the 13th of December. We shall quote Dr. Lightfoot's own rendering of his further important narrative. He says:—

"The words of John Malalas are:

[1] *Hist. of Christianity*, ii., p. 101 f.

"The same king Trajan was residing in the same city (Antioch) when the visitation of God (*i.e.*, the earthquake) occurred. And at that time the holy Ignatius, the bishop of the city of Antioch, was martyred (or bore testimony, ἐμαρτύρησε) before him (ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ); for he was exasperated against him because he reviled him.'"[1]

Dr. Lightfoot endeavours in every way to discredit this statement. He argues that Malalas tells foolish stories about other matters, and, therefore, is not to be believed here; but so simple a piece of information may well be correctly conveyed by a writer who elsewhere may record stupid traditions.[2] If the narrative of foolish stories and fabulous traditions is to exclude belief in everything else stated by those who relate them, the whole of the Fathers are disposed of at one fell swoop, for they all do so. Then Dr. Lightfoot actually makes use of the following extraordinary argument to explain away the statement of Malalas :—

"But it may be worth while adding that the error of Malalas is capable of easy explanation. He has probably misinterpreted some earlier authority, whose language lent itself to misinterpretation. The words μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία, which were afterwards used especially of martyrdom, had in the earlier ages a wider sense, including other modes of witnessing to the faith: the expression ἐπὶ Τραϊάνου again is ambiguous and might denote either 'during the reign of Trajan' or 'in the presence of Trajan.' A blundering writer like Malalas might have stumbled over either expression."[3]

It would be difficult, indeed, to show that the words μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία, already used in that sense in the New Testament, were not, at the date at which any record of the martyrdom of Ignatius which Malalas could have had before him was written, employed to express martyrdom when applied to such a case, as Dr. Lightfoot, indeed, has in the first instance rendered the phrase. Even Zahn, whom Dr. Lightfoot so implicitly follows, emphatically decides against him on both points. "The ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ together with τότε can only signify '*coram Trajano*' ('in the presence of Trajan'), and ἐμαρτύρησε only the execution."[4] Let anyone simply read over Dr. Lightfoot's own rendering, which we have quoted above, and he will see that Malalas seems excellently well, and directly, to have interpreted his earlier authority.

That the statement of Malalas does not agree with the reports of the Fathers is no real objection, for we have good reason to believe that none of them had information from any other source than the Ignatian Epistles themselves, or tradition. Eusebius evidently had not. Irenæus, Origen, and some later Fathers tell us nothing about him. Jerome and Chrysostom clearly take their accounts from these sources. Malalas is the first who, by his variation, proves that he had another and different authority

[1] P. 276 (ed. Bonn), *Contemporary Review*, February, 1875, p. 352.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 353 f. [3] *Ib.*, p. 353 f. [4] *Ignatius v. Ant.*, p. 66, anm. 3.

before him, and, in abandoning the martyr-journey to Rome, his account has infinitely greater apparent probability. Malalas lived at Antioch, which adds some weight to his statement. It is objected that so, also, did Chrysostom, and at an earlier period, and yet he repeats the Roman story. This, however, is no valid argument against Malalas. Chrysostom was too good a Churchman to doubt the story of Epistles so much tending to edification, which were in wide circulation, and had been quoted by earlier Fathers. It is in no way surprising that, some two centuries and a half after the martyrdom, he should quietly have accepted the representations of the Epistles purporting to have been written by the martyr himself, and that their story should have shaped the prevailing tradition.

The remains of Ignatius, as we are informed by Chrysostom and Jerome, long remained interred in the cemetery of Antioch, but finally—in the time of Theodosius, it is said—were translated with great pomp and ceremony to a building which, such is the irony of events, had previously been a Temple of Fortune. The story told, of course, is that the relics of the martyr had been carefully collected in the Coliseum and carried from Rome to Antioch. After reposing there for some centuries, the relics, which are said to have been transported from Rome to Antioch, were, about the seventh century, carried back from Antioch to Rome.[1] The natural and more simple conclusion is that, instead of this double translation, the bones of Ignatius had always remained in Antioch, where he had suffered martyrdom, and the tradition that they had been brought back from Rome was merely the explanation which reconciled the fact of their actually being in Antioch with the legend of the Ignatian Epistles.

The 20th of December is the date assigned to the death of Ignatius in the Martyrology,[2] and Zahn admits that this interpretation is undeniable.[3] Moreover, the anniversary of his death was celebrated on that day in the Greek churches and throughout the East. In the Latin Church it is kept on the 1st of February. There can be little doubt that this was the day of the translation of the relics to Rome, and this was evidently the view of Ruinart, who, although he could not positively contradict the views of his own Church, says: "*Ignatii festum Græci vigesima die mensis Decembris celebrant, quo ipsum passum fuisse Acta testantur; Latini vero die prima Februarii, an ob aliquam sacrarum ejus reliquiarum*

[1] I need not refer to the statement of Nicephorus that these relics were first brought from Rome to Constantinople and afterwards translated to Antioch.

[2] Ruinart, *Acta Mart.*, pp. 59, 69.

[3] *Ignatius v. Ant.*, p. 68.

translationem? plures enim fuisse constat."[1] Zahn[2] states that the Feast of the translation in later calendars was celebrated on the 29th of January, and he points out the evident ignorance which prevailed in the West regarding Ignatius.[3]

On the one hand, therefore, all the historical data which we possess regarding the reign and character of Trajan discredit the story that Ignatius was sent to Rome to be exposed to beasts in the Coliseum ; and all the positive evidence which exists, independent of the Epistles themselves, tends to establish the fact that he suffered martyrdom in Antioch itself. On the other hand, all the evidence which is offered for the statement that Ignatius was sent to Rome is more or less directly based upon the representations of the letters, the authenticity of which is in discussion, and it is surrounded with improbabilities of every kind.

We might well spare our readers the trouble of examining further the contents of the Epistles themselves, for it is manifest that they cannot afford testimony of any value on the subject of our inquiry. We shall, however, briefly point out all the passages contained in the seven Greek Epistles which have any bearing upon our Synoptic Gospels, in order that their exact position may be more fully appreciated. Tischendorf[4] refers to a passage in the Epistle to the Romans, c. vi., as a verbal quotation of Matt. xvi. 26, but he neither gives the context nor states the facts of the case. The passage reads as follows : "The pleasures of the world shall profit me nothing, nor the kingdoms of this time ; it is better for me to die for Jesus Christ than to reign over the ends of the earth. For what is a man profited if he gain the whole world but lose his soul?"[5] Now, this quotation not only is not found in the Syriac version of the Epistle, but it is also omitted from the ancient Latin version, and is absent from the passage in the work of Timotheus of Alexandria against the Council of Chalcedon, and from other authorities. It is evidently a later addition, and is recognised as

[1] Ruinart, *Acta Mart.*, p. 56. Baronius makes the anniversary of the martyrdom 1st February, and that of the translation 17th December. *Mart. Rom.*, p. 87, p. 766 ff.

[2] *Ignatius v. Ant.*, p. 27, p. 68, anm. 2.

[3] There is no sufficient evidence for the statement that in Chrysostom's time the day dedicated to Ignatius was in June. The mere allusion, in a Homily delivered in honour of Ignatius, that "recently" the feast of Sta. Pelagia (in the Latin Calendar 9th June) had been celebrated, by no means justifies such a conclusion and there is nothing else to establish it.

[4] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 22.

[5] Οὐδέν με ὠφελήσει τὰ πέρατα τοῦ κόσμου, οὐδὲ αἱ βασιλεῖαι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. Καλόν μοι ἀποθανεῖν διὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἢ βασιλεύειν τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς. Τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἐὰν κερδήσῃ τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῇ ; c. vi.

such by most critics.[1] It was probably a gloss, which subsequently was inserted in the text. Of these facts, however, Tischendorf does not say a word.[2]

The next passage to which he refers is in the Epistle to the Smyrnæans, c. i., where the writer says of Jesus, "He was baptised by John in order that all righteousness might be fulfilled by Him,"[3] which Tischendorf considers a reminiscence of Matt. iii. 15, "For thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness."[4] The phrase, besides being no quotation, has, again, all the appearance of being an addition; and when in ch. iii. of the same Epistle we find a palpable quotation from an apocryphal Gospel, which Jerome states to be the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," to which we shall presently refer, a Gospel which we know to have contained the baptism of Jesus by John, it is not possible, even if the Epistle were genuine, which it is not, to base any such conclusion upon these words. There is not only the alternative of tradition, but the use of the same apocryphal Gospel, elsewhere quoted in the Epistle, as the source of the reminiscence.

Tischendorf does not point out any more supposed references to our Synoptic Gospels, but we proceed to notice all the other passages which have been indicated by others. In the Epistle to Polycarp, c. ii., the following sentence occurs: "Be thou wise as the serpent in everything, and harmless as the dove." This is, of course, compared with Matt. x. 16, "Be ye therefore, wise as serpents, and innocent as doves." The Greek of both is as follows:—

Epistle.	Matt. x. 16.
Φρόνιμος γίνου ὡς ὁ ὄφις ἐν πᾶσιν καὶ ἀκέραιος ὡς ἡ περιστερά.	Γίνεσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις[5] καὶ ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστεραί,

In the Syriac version the passage reads, "Be thou wise as the serpent in everything, and harmless as to those things which are requisite as the dove."[6] It is unnecessary to add that no source is indicated for the reminiscence. Ewald assigns this part of our first Gospel originally to the Spruchsammlung, and, even apart from the variations presented in the Epistle, there is nothing to

[1] Anger, *Synops. Ev.*, p. 119 f.; Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Version*, etc., p. 42 ff.; Dressel, *Patr. Ap.*, p. 170; Grabe, *Spicil Patr.*, ii., p. 16; Jacobson, *Patr. Ap.*, ii., p. 402; Kirchhofer, *Quellensamml.*, p. 48, anm. 6; etc.

[2] Dr. Lightfoot omits the supposed quotation from his text of the Epistle—*Apost. Fathers*, p. 122. Dr. Westcott does not refer to the passage at all.

[3] βεβαπτισμένον ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου, ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ. c. i.

[4] οὕτως γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην.

[5] *The Cod. Sin.* alone reads ὡς ὁ ὄφις here.

[6] Cf. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Version*, etc., p. 5, p. 72.

warrant exclusive selection of our first Gospel as the source of the saying. The remaining passages we subjoin in parallel columns :—

Ep. to the Ephesians v.	Matt. xviii. 19.
For if the prayer of one or two has such power, how much more that of the bishop and of all the Church.[1]	Again I say unto you that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask it shall be done for them by my Father. v. 20. For where two or three are gathered together, etc.
Ep. to Ephesians vi.	Matt. x. 40.
For every one whom the Master of the house sends to be over his own household we ought to receive as we should him that sent (*πέμψαντα*) him.	He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent (*ἀποστείλαντα*) me.
Πάντα γὰρ ὃν πέμπει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης εἰς ἰδίαν οἰκονομίαν, οὕτως δεῖ ἡμᾶς αὐτὸν δέχεσθαι, ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν πέμψαντα.	*Ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται, καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.*
Ep. to Tralians xi.	Matt. xv. 13.
For these are not a planting of the Father.	Every plant which my heavenly Father did not plant shall be rooted up.
Οὗτοι γὰρ οὐκ εἰσιν φυτεία πατρός.	*Πᾶσα φυτεία ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος ἐκριζωθήσεται.*
Ep. to Smyrnæans vi.	Matt. xix. 12.
He that receiveth it let him receive it.	He that is able to receive it let him receive it.
Ὁ χωρῶν χωρείτω.	*Ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρείτω.*

None of these passages are quotations, and they generally present such marked linguistic variations from the parallel passages in our first Gospel that there is not the slightest ground for specially referring them to it. The last words cited are introduced without any appropriate context. In no case are the expressions indicated as quotations from, or references to, any particular source. They may either be traditional, or reminiscences of some of the numerous Gospels current in the early Church, such as the Gospel according to the Hebrews. That the writer made use of one of these cannot be doubted. In the Epistle to the Smyrnæans, c. iii., there occurs a quotation from an apocryphal Gospel to which we have already, in passing, referred : " For I know that also after his resurrection he was in the flesh, and I believe he is so now. And when he came to those who were with Peter he said to them : Lay hold, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit (*δαιμόνιον*).

[1] *Εἰ γὰρ ἑνὸς καὶ δευτέρου προσευχὴ τοσαύτην ἰσχὺν ἔχει, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἥ τε τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας ;*

And immediately they touched him and believed, being convinced by his flesh and spirit."[1] Eusebius, who quotes this passage, says that he does not know whence it is taken.[2] Origen, however, quotes it from a work well known in the early Church, called "The Teaching of Peter" (Διδαχὴ Πέτρου);[3] and Jerome found it in the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," in use among the Nazarenes,[4] which he translated, as we shall hereafter see. It was, no doubt, in both of those works. The narrative, Luke xxiv. 39 f., being neglected, and an apocryphal Gospel used here, the inevitable inference is clear, and very suggestive. As it is certain that this quotation was taken from a source different from our Gospels, there is reason to suppose that the other passages which we have cited are reminiscences of the same work. The passage on the three mysteries in the Epistle to the Ephesians, c. xix., is evidently another quotation from an uncanonical source.[5]

We must, however, again point out that, with the single exception of the short passage in the Epistle to Polycarp, c. ii., which is not a quotation, none of these supposed reminiscences of our Synoptic Gospels are found in the Syriac version of the three Epistles.

With regard to Scriptural quotations in all the seven Ignatian letters, it may be well to quote the words of Dr. Lightfoot. "The Ignatian letters do, indeed, show a considerable knowledge of the writings included in our Canon of the New Testament; but this knowledge betrays itself in casual words and phrases, stray metaphors, epigrammatic adaptations, and isolated coincidences of thought. Where there is an obligation, the borrowed figure or expression has passed through the mind of the writer, has been assimilated, and has undergone some modification in the process. Quotations from the New Testament, strictly speaking, there are none."[6] Dr. Lightfoot is speaking here, not only of the Gospels, but of the whole New Testament, and he adds, in regard to such approaches: "Even such examples can be counted on the fingers." Without discussing how such knowledge can be limited to special writings, it is obvious that, whatever view may be taken of the Ignatian letters, they afford no evidence

[1] Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα. Καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς· "Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον." Καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἥψαντο, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, κραθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ αἵματι.

[2] οὐκ οἶδ' ὁπόθεν ῥητοῖς συγκέχρηται. *H. E.*, iii. 36.

[3] *De Princip. Præf.*, § 8.

[4] *De vir. ill.*, 16; cf. *Comm.* in *Is. lib.* xviii., *præf.*

[5] Cf. Ewald, *Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.*, vii., p. 318, anm. 1.

[6] *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii., vol. i., 1885, p. 580.

even of the existence of our Gospels, and throw no light whatever on their authorship and trustworthiness as witnesses for miracles and the reality of Divine revelation.

We have hitherto deferred all consideration of the so-called Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, from the fact that, instead of proving the existence of the Epistles of Ignatius, with which it is intimately associated, it is itself discredited in proportion as they are shown to be inauthentic. We have just seen that the martyr-journey of Ignatius to Rome is, for cogent reasons, declared to be wholly fabulous, and the Epistles purporting to be written during that journey must be held to be spurious. The Epistle of Polycarp, however, not only refers to the martyr-journey (c. ix.), but to the Ignatian Epistles which are inauthentic (c. xiii.), and the manifest inference is that it also is spurious.

Polycarp, who is said by Irenæus[1] to have been in his youth a disciple of the Apostle John, became Bishop of Smyrna, and suffered martyrdom at a very advanced age.[2] On the authority of Eusebius and Jerome it has hitherto been generally believed that his death took place in A.D. 166–167. In the account of his martyrdom, which we possess in the shape of a letter from the Church of Smyrna, purporting to have been written by eye-witnesses, which must be pronounced spurious, Polycarp is said to have died under the Proconsul Statius Quadratus.[3] If this statement be correct, the date hitherto received can no longer be maintained, for recent investigations have determined that Statius Quadratus was proconsul in A.D. 155–5 or 155–6.[4] Some critics, who affirm the authenticity of the Epistle attributed to Polycarp, date the Epistle before A.D. 120, but the preponderance of opinion assigns it to a much later period. Doubts of its authenticity, and of the integrity of the text, were very early expressed, and the close scrutiny to which later and more competent criticism has subjected it has led very many to the conclusion that the Epistle is either largely interpolated or altogether spurious. The principal argument in favour of its authenticity is the fact that the Epistle is mentioned by Irenæus,[5] who in his extreme

[1] *Adv. Hær.*, iii., 3, § 4; cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 20.

[2] In the *Mart. Polycarpi* (c. 9) he is represented as declaring that he had served Christ eighty-six years.

[3] *Mart. Polycarpi*, c. 21.

[4] Waddington, *Mém. de l'Inst. imp. de France, Acad. des Inscript. et Belles Lettres*, T. xxvi., 1 Part., 1867, p. 232 ff.; cf. *Fastes des Provinces Asiatiques*, 1872, 1 Part., p. 219 ff. It should be mentioned, however, that in A.D. 167 there was a Consul of the name of Ummidius Quadratus (Waddington, l.c., p. 238). Wieseler and Keim reject M. Waddington's conclusions, and adhere to the later date.

[5] *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 4.

youth was acquainted with Polycarp.[1] We have no very precise information regarding the age of Irenæus; but Jerome states that he flourished under Commodus (180–192), and we may, as a favourable conjecture, suppose that he was then about 35–37. In that case his birth must be dated about A.D. 145. There is reason to believe that he fell a victim to persecution under Septimius Severus, and it is only doubtful whether he suffered during the first outbreak in A.D. 202 or later. According to this calculation the martyrdom of Polycarp, in A.D. 155–156, took place when he was ten or eleven years of age. Even if a further concession be made in regard to his age, it is evident that the intercourse of Irenæus with the Bishop of Smyrna must have been confined to his very earliest years—a fact which is confirmed by the almost total absence of any record in his writings of the communications of Polycarp. This certainly does not entitle Irenæus to speak more authoritatively of an Epistle ascribed to Polycarp than anyone else of his day.

In the Epistle itself there are several anachronisms. In ch. ix. the "blessed Ignatius" is referred to as already dead, and he is held up with Zosimus and Rufus, and also with Paul and the rest of the Apostles, as examples of patience—men who have not run in vain, but are with the Lord; but in ch. xiii. he is spoken of as living, and information is requested regarding him, "and those who are with him."[2] Yet, although thus spoken of as alive, the writer already knows of his Epistles, and refers, in the plural, to those written by him "to us, and all the rest which we have by us."[3] The reference here, it will be observed, is not only to the Epistles to the Smyrnæans, and to Polycarp himself, but to other spurious Epistles which are not included in the Syriac version. Daillé[4] pointed out long ago that ch. xiii. abruptly interrupts the conclusion of the Epistle, and most critics, including those who assert the authenticity of the rest of the Epistle, reject it, at least, although many of these likewise repudiate ch. ix. as interpolated. Others, however, consider that the latter chapter is quite consistent with the later date, which, according to internal evidence, must be assigned to the Epistle. The writer vehemently denounces,[5] as already widely spread, the Gnostic heresy and other forms of false doctrine which did not exist until the time of Marcion, to whom

[1] Ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ κ.τ.λ. *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 4, Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv., 14, cf. v. 20.

[2] *Et de ipso Ignatio, et de his qui cum eo sunt, quod certius agnoveritis, significate.* Cf. Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, i., p. 184 f.

[3] Τὰς ἐπιστολὰς Ἰγνατίου τὰς πεμφθείσας ἡμῖν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄλλας ὅσας εἴχομεν παρ' ἡμῖν, κ.τ.λ.

[4] *De Scriptis*, etc., 427 ff.

[5] Cf. chaps. vi., vii.

and to whose followers he refers in unmistakeable terms. An expression is used in ch. vii., in speaking of these heretics, which Polycarp is reported by Irenæus to have actually applied to Marcion in person, during his visit to Rome. He is said to have called Marcion the "first-born of Satan" (πρωτότοκος τοῦ Σατανᾶ),[1] and the same term is employed in this Epistle with regard to everyone who holds such false doctrines. The development of these heresies, therefore, implies a date for the composition of the Epistle, at earliest, after the middle of the second century, a date which is further confirmed by other circumstances.[2] The writer of such a letter must have held a position in the Church, to which Polycarp could only have attained in the latter part of his life, when he was deputed to Rome for the Paschal discussion, and the Epistle depicts the developed ecclesiastical organisation of a later time.[3] The earlier date which has now been adopted for the martyrdom of Polycarp by limiting the period during which it is possible that he himself could have written any portion of it, only renders the inauthenticity of the Epistle more apparent. Hilgenfeld has pointed out, as another indication of the same date, the injunction, "Pray for the kings" (*Orate pro regibus*), which, in 1 Peter ii. 17, is "Honour the King" (τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε), which, he argues, accords with the period after Antoninus Pius had elevated Marcus Aurelius to joint sovereignty (A.D. 147), or, better still, with that in which Marcus Aurelius appointed Lucius Verus his colleague, A.D. 161; for to rulers outside the Roman Empire there can be no reference. If authentic, however, the Epistle must have been written, at latest, shortly after the martyrdom of Ignatius in A.D. 115; but, as we have seen, there are strong internal characteristics excluding such a supposition. The reference to the

[1] *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 4; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 14.

[2] Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeit*, ii., p. 155 f.; Hilgenfeld, *Die ap. Väter*, p. 272 f.; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1874, p. 208 f.; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 41 ff.; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 44 ff. Schwegler and Hilgenfeld consider the insertion of this phrase, reported to have been actually used in Rome against Marcion, as proof of the inauthenticity of the Epistle. They argue that the well-known saying was employed to give an appearance of reality to the forgery. In any case, it shows that the Epistle cannot have been written earlier than the second half of the second century.

[3] Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, ii., p. 158; Hilgenfeld, *Die ap. Väter*, p. 273; Ritschl., *Enst. altk. Kirche*, p. 402 f.; Scholten, *Die. ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 42. It has been pointed out that, in the superscription, Polycarp is clearly distinguished, as Bishop, from the Presbyters of Smyrna: Πολύκαρπος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβύτεροι. Dorner, *Lehre Pers. Christi*, 1851, i., p. 172 f. anm.; Rothe, *Anfänge chr. Kirche*, 1837, i., p. 408 f. anm. 107, 108; Hilgenfeld, l. c.; Ritschl., l. c. The writer, in admonishing the Philippians, speaks of their "being subject to the Presbyters and Deacons as to God and Christ" ὑποτασσομένους τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις ὡς τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Χριστῷ κ.τ.λ. c. 5.

martyr-journey of Ignatiûs and to the Epistles falsely ascribed to him is alone sufficient to betray the spurious nature of the composition, and to class the Epistle with the rest of the pseudo-Ignatian literature.

We shall now examine all the passages in this Epistle which are pointed out as indicating any acquaintance with our Synoptic Gospels.[1] The first occurs in ch. ii., and we subjoin it in contrast with the nearest parallel passages of the Gospels; but, although we break it up into paragraphs, it will, of course, be understood that the quotation is continuous in the Epistle:—

Epistle, c. ii.	Matthew.
Remembering what the Lord said, teaching:	
Judge not, that ye be not judged;	vii. 1. Judge not, that ye be not judged.
forgive, and it shall be forgiven to you;	vi. 14. For if ye forgive men their trespasses your heavenly Father will also forgive you: (cf. Luke vi. 37.....pardon and ye shall be pardoned.)
be pitiful, that ye may be pitied;	v. 7. Blessed are the pitiful, for they shall obtain pity.
with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again; and that blessed are the poor and those that are persecuted for righteousness sake, for theirs is the kingdom of God.	vii. 2. With what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you. v. 3. Blessed are the poor in spirit.....v. 10. Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Epistle c. ii.	Matthew.
Μνημονεύοντες δὲ ὧν εἶπεν ὁ κύριος διδάσκων·	
Μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε. *ἀφίετε, καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν.*	vii. i. *Μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε.* vi. 14. *Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κ. τ. λ.* (cf. Luke vi. 37, *Ἀπολύετε καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε.*)
ἐλεᾶτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε·	v. 7. *Μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται.*
ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.	vii. 2. *ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.*
καὶ ὅτι μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ καὶ οἱ διωκόμενοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.	v. 3. *Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι*—10 *μακ. οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.*

It will be remembered that an almost similar direct quotation of words of Jesus occurs in the so-called Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, ch. xiii., which we have already examined.[2] There the

[1] Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 23 f.; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 48, note.
[2] P. 223 f.

passage is introduced by the same words, and in the midst of brief phrases which have parallels in our Gospel there occurs in both Epistles the same expression, "Be pitiful, that ye may be pitied," which is not found in any of our Gospels. In order to find parallels for the quotation, upon the hypothesis of a combination of texts, we have to add together portions of the following verses in the order shown: Matt. vii. 1, vi. 14 (although, with complete linguistic variations, the sense of Luke vi. 37 is much closer), v. 7, vii. 2, v. 3, v. 10. Such fragmentary compilation is in itself scarcely conceivable in an Epistle of this kind, but when in the midst we find a passage foreign to our Gospels, which occurs in another work in connection with so similar a quotation, it is reasonable to conclude that the whole is derived from tradition or from a Gospel different from ours. In no case can such a passage be considered material evidence even of the existence of any one of our Gospels.

Another expression which is pointed out occurs in ch. vii., "beseeching in our prayers the all-searching God not to lead us into temptation, as the Lord said: The spirit, indeed, is willing, but the flesh is weak."[1] This is compared with the phrase in "the Lord's Prayer" (Matt. vi. 13), or the passage (xxvi. 41): "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit, indeed, is willing, but the flesh is weak."[2] The second Gospel, however, equally has the phrase (xiv. 38), and shows how unreasonable it is to limit these historical sayings to a single Gospel. The next passage is of a similar nature (ch. vi.): "If, therefore, we pray the Lord that he may forgive us, we ought also ourselves to forgive."[3] The thought, but not the language, of this passage corresponds with Matt. vi. 12–14, but equally so with Luke xi. 4. Now, we must repeat that all such sayings of Jesus were the common property of the early Christians—were, no doubt, orally current amongst them, and still more certainly were recorded by many of the numerous Gospels then in circulation, as they are by several of our own. In no case is there any written source indicated from which these passages are derived; they are simply quoted as words of Jesus, and, being all connected either with the "Sermon on the Mount" or the "Lord's Prayer," the two portions of the teaching of Jesus which were most popular, widely known, and characteristic, there can be no doubt that they were familiar throughout the whole of the early Church, and must

[1] *δεήσεσιν αἰτούμενοι τὸν παντεπόπτην θεὸν, μὴ εἰσενεγκεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμὸν, καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ κύριος· τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής.* c. vii.

[2] *γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν. τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής.* Matt. xxvi. 41.

[3] *Εἰ οὖν δεόμεθα τοῦ κυρίου, ἵνα ἡμῖν ἀφῇ, ὀφείλομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιέναι.* c. vi.

have formed a part of most, or all, of the many collections of the words of the Master. The anonymous quotation of historical expressions of Jesus cannot prove even the existence of one special document among many to which we may choose to trace it, much less establish its authorship and character.

CHAPTER III.

JUSTIN MARTYR

We shall now consider the evidence furnished by the works of Justin Martyr regarding the existence of our Synoptic Gospels at the middle of the second century, and we may remark, in anticipation, that, whatever differences of opinion may finally exist regarding the solution of the problem which we have to examine, at least it is clear that the testimony of Justin Martyr is not of a nature to establish the date, authenticity, and character of Gospels professing to communicate such momentous and astounding doctrines. The determination of the source from which Justin derived his facts of Christian history has for a century attracted more attention, and excited more controversy, than almost any other similar question in connection with patristic literature, and upon none have more divergent opinions been expressed.

Justin, who suffered martyrdom about A.D. 166–167[1] under Marcus Aurelius, probably at the instigation of the cynical philosopher, Crescens, was born in the Greek-Roman colony, Flavia Neapolis,[2] established during the reign of Vespasian, near the ancient Sichem in Samaria. By descent he was a Greek, and during the earlier part of his life a heathen; but, after long and disappointed study of Greek philosophy, he became a convert to Christianity[3] strongly tinged with Judaism. It is not necessary to enter into any discussion as to the authenticity of the writings which have come down to us bearing Justin's name, many of which are undoubtedly spurious, for the two Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho, with which we have almost exclusively to do, are generally admitted to be genuine. It is true that there has been a singular controversy regarding the precise relation to each other of the two Apologies now extant, the following contradictory views having been maintained: that they are the two Apologies mentioned by Eusebius, and in their original order; that they are Justin's two Apologies, but that Eusebius was wrong in affirming that the second was addressed to Marcus Aurelius; that our second Apology was the preface or appendix to the first, and that the original second is lost. The shorter

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 16, *Chron. Paschale*, A.D. 165. [2] *Apol.*, i. 1.
[3] *Dial. c. Tryph.*, ii. ff.

Apology contains nothing of interest connected with our inquiry.

There has been much controversy as to the date of the two Apologies, and much difference of opinion still exists on the point. Many critics assign the larger to about A.D. 138-140, and the shorter to A.D. 160-161. A passage, however, occurs in the longer Apology, which indicates that it must have been written about a century and a half after the commencement of the Christian era, or, according to accurate reckoning, about A.D. 147. Justin speaks, in one part of it, of perverted deductions being drawn from his teaching "that Christ was born 150 years ago under Cyrenius."[1] Those who contend for the earlier date have no stronger argument against this statement than the unsupported assertion, that in this passage Justin merely speaks "in round numbers"; but many important circumstances confirm the date which Justin thus gives us. In the superscription of the Apology, Antoninus is called "Pius," a title which was first bestowed upon him in the year 139. Moreover, Justin directly refers to Marcion, as a man "now living and teaching his disciples.....and who has, by the aid of demons, caused many of all nations to utter blasphemies," etc.[2] Now the fact has been established that Marcion did not come to Rome, where Justin himself was, until A.D. 139-142, when his prominent public career commenced, and it is apparent that the words of Justin indicate a period when his doctrines had already become widely diffused. For these and many other strong reasons, which need not here be detailed, the majority of competent critics agree in more correctly assigning the first Apology to about A.D. 147. The *Dialogue with Trypho*, as internal evidence shows,[3] was written after the longer Apology, and it is therefore generally dated some time within the first decade of the second half of the second century.

In these writings Justin quotes very copiously from the Old Testament, and he also very frequently refers to facts of Christian history and to sayings of Jesus. Of these references, for instance, some fifty occur in the first Apology, and upwards of seventy in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, a goodly number, it will be admitted, by means of which to identify the source from which he quotes. Justin himself frequently and distinctly says that his information and quotations are derived from the *Memoirs of the Apostles* (ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων), but except upon one occasion, which we shall hereafter consider, when he indicates Peter, he never mentions an author's name. Upon examination it is found that, with only one or two brief exceptions, the numerous quotations from these Memoirs differ more or less widely from parallel passages in our Synoptic Gospels, and in

[1] *Apol.*, i. 46. [2] *Apol.*, i. 26. [3] *Dial. c. Tr.*, cxx.

many cases differ in the same respects as similar quotations found in other writings of the second century, the writers of which are known to have made use of uncanonical Gospels; and, further, that these passages are quoted several times, at intervals, by Justin with the same variations. Moreover, sayings of Jesus are quoted from these Memoirs which are not found in our Gospels at all, and facts in the life of Jesus and circumstances of Christian history derived from the same source, not only are not found in our Gospels, but are in contradiction with them.

These peculiarities have, as might have been expected, created much diversity of opinion regarding the nature of the *Memoirs of the Apostles*. In the earlier days of New Testament criticism more especially, many of course at once identified the Memoirs with our Gospels exclusively, and the variations were explained by conveniently elastic theories of free quotation from memory, imperfect and varying MSS., combination, condensation, and transposition of passages, with slight additions from tradition, or even from some other written source, and so on. Others endeavoured to explain away difficulties by the supposition that they were a simple harmony of our Gospels, or a harmony of the Gospels, with passages added from some apocryphal work. A much greater number of critics, however, adopt the conclusion that, along with our Gospels, Justin made use of one or more apocryphal Gospels, and more especially of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or according to Peter, and also perhaps of tradition. Others assert that he made use of a special unknown Gospel, or of the Gospel according to the Hebrews or according to Peter, with the subsidiary use of a version of one or two of our Gospels, to which, however, he did not attach much importance, preferring the apocryphal work; whilst others have concluded that Justin did not make use of our Gospels at all, and that his quotations are either from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or according to Peter, or from some other special apocryphal Gospel now no longer extant.

Evidence permitting of such wide diversity of results to serious and laborious investigation of the identity of Justin's *Memoirs of the Apostles* cannot be of much value towards establishing the authenticity of our Gospels, and, in the absence of any specific mention of our Synoptics, any very elaborate examination of the Memoirs might be considered unnecessary, more especially as it is admitted almost universally by competent critics that Justin did not himself consider the *Memoirs of the Apostles* inspired, or of any dogmatic authority, and had no idea of attributing canonical rank to them. In pursuance of the system which we desire invariably to adopt of enabling every reader to form his own opinion, we shall, as briefly as possible, state the facts of the

case, and furnish materials for a full comprehension of the subject.

Justin himself, as we have already mentioned, frequently and distinctly states that his information regarding Christian history and his quotations are derived from the *Memoirs of the Apostles* (*ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*), to adopt the usual translation, although the word might more correctly be rendered "Recollections," or "Memorabilia." It has frequently been surmised that this name was suggested by the *ἀπομνημονεύματα Σωκράτους* of Xenophon, but, as Credner has pointed out, the similarity is purely accidental, and, to constitute a parallel, the title should have been *Memoirs of Jesus*.[1] The word *ἀπομνημονεύματα* is here evidently used merely in the sense of records written from memory, and it is so employed by Papias in the passage preserved by Eusebius regarding Mark, who, although he had not himself followed the Lord, yet recorded his words from what he heard from Peter, and who, having done so without order, is still defended for "thus writing some things as he remembered them" (*οὕτως ἕνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν*).[2] In the same way Irenæus refers to the "Memoirs of a certain Presbyter of apostolic times" (*ἀπομνημονεύματα ἀποστολικοῦ τινὸς πρεσβυτέρου*),[3] whose name he does not mention; and Origen still more closely approximates to Justin's use of the word when, expressing his theory regarding the Epistle to the Hebrews, he says that the thoughts are the Apostle's, but the phraseology and the composition are of one recording from memory what the Apostle said (*ἀπομνημονεύσαντός τινος τὰ ἀποστολικὰ*), and as of one writing at leisure the dictation of his master.[4] Justin himself speaks of the authors of the Memoirs as *οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες*,[5] and the expression was then and afterwards constantly in use amongst ecclesiastical and other writers.[6]

This title, *Memoirs of the Apostles*, however, although the most appropriate to mere recollections of the life and teaching of Jesus, evidently could not be applied to works ranking as canonical Gospels, but, in fact, excludes such an idea; and the whole of Justin's views regarding Holy Scripture prove that he saw in the Memoirs merely records from memory to assist memory. He does not call them *γραφαί*, but adheres always to the familiar name of *ἀπομνημονεύματα*, and whilst his constant appeals to a

[1] Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 105. [2] Eusebius, *H.E.*, iii. 39.
[3] *Ib*, v. 8. [4] *Ib.*, vi. 25. [5] *Apol.*, i. 33.
[6] Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 105 f., *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 12; Reuss, *Hist. du Canon*, p. 53 f.; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 95, note 1. The Clementine Recognitions (ii. 1) make the Apostle Peter say: *In consuetudine habui verba domini mei, quæ ab ipso audieram revocare ad memoriam.*

written source show very clearly his abandonment of oral tradition, there is nothing in the name of his records which can identify them with our Gospels.

Justin designates the source of his quotations ten times, the *Memoirs of the Apostles*,[1] and five times he calls it simply the "Memoirs."[2] He says, upon one occasion, that these Memoirs were composed "by his Apostles and their followers,"[3] but except in one place to which we have already referred, and which we shall hereafter fully examine, he never mentions the author's name, nor does he ever give any more precise information regarding their composition. It has been argued that, in saying that these Memoirs were recorded by the Apostles and their followers, Justin intentionally and literally described the four canonical Gospels, the first and fourth of which are ascribed to Apostles and the other two to Mark and Luke, the followers of Apostles; but such an inference is equally forced and unfounded. The language itself forbids this explanation, for Justin does not speak indefinitely of Memoirs of Apostles and their followers, but of Memoirs of *the* Apostles, invariably using the article which refers the Memoirs to the collective body of the Apostles. Moreover, the incorrectness of such an inference is manifest from the fact that circumstances are stated by Justin as derived from these Memoirs, which do not exist in our Gospels at all, and which, indeed, are contradictory to them. Vast numbers of spurious writings, moreover, bearing the names of Apostles and their followers, and claiming more or less direct apostolic authority, were in circulation in the early Church—Gospels according to Peter,[4] to Thomas,[5] to James,[6] to Judas,[7] according to the Apostles, or according to the Twelve,[8] to Barnabas,[9] to Matthias,[10] to Nicodemus,[11] etc., and ecclesiastical

[1] *Apol.*, i. 66, 67, cf. i. 33; *Dial. c. Tr.*, 88, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, and twice in 106. [2] *Dial.*, 103, 105, thrice 107.

[3] Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι ἃ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντετάχθαι, κ.τ.λ. *Dial.*, 103.

[4] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii., 3, 25, vi. 12; Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 1; Origen, in *Matth.*, x. 17.

[5] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii., 25; Origen, *Hom.* i. in *Lucam*; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 20; cf. Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, 1853, *proleg.*, p. xxxviii. ff.; *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 89 f.; Hieron., *Præf. in Matth.*

[6] Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr. proleg.*, p. xii. ff.; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, lxxix., § 5, etc.

[7] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 31, § 1; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxxviii., § 1; Theodoret, *Fab. Hær.*, i. 15.

[8] Origen, *Hom.* i. in *Lucam*; Hieron., *Præf. in Matth.*; *Adv. Pelægianos*, iii. 1; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 339 f.

[9] *Decret. Gelasii*, vi., § 10.

[10] Origen, *Hom.* i. in *Lucam*: Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii., 25; *Decret. Gelasii*, vi. 8; Hieron., *Præf. in Matth.*

[11] If this be not its most ancient title, the Gospel is in the Prologue directly ascribed to Nicodemus. The superscription which this apocryphal

writers bear abundant testimony to the early and rapid growth of apocryphal literature.[1] The very names of most of such apocryphal Gospels are lost, whilst of others we possess considerable information; but nothing is more certain than the fact that there existed many works bearing names which render the attempt to interpret the title of Justin's Gospel as a description of the four in our canon quite unwarrantable. The words of Justin evidently imply simply that the source of his quotations is the collective recollections of the Apostles, and those who followed them, regarding the life and teaching of Jesus.

The title, *Memoirs of the Apostles*, by no means indicates a plurality of Gospels. A single passage has been pointed out in which the Memoirs are said to have been called εὐαγγέλια in the plural: "For the Apostles in the Memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels,"[2] etc. The last expression, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, as many scholars have declared, is probably an interpolation. It is, in all likelihood, a gloss on the margin of some old MS. which some copyist afterwards inserted in the text.[3] If Justin really stated that the Memoirs were called Gospels, it seems incomprehensible that he should never call them so himself. In no other place in his writings does he apply the plural to them, but, on the contrary, we find Trypho referring to the "so-called Gospel," which he states that he has carefully read,[4] and which, of course, can only be Justin's "Memoirs"; and, again, in another part of the same dialogue, Justin quotes passages which are written "in the Gospel"[5] (ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται). The term "Gospel" is nowhere else used by Justin in reference to a written record.[6] In no case, however, considering the numerous Gospels then in circulation, and the fact that many of these, different from the canonical Gospels, are known to have been

Gospel bears in the form now extant, ὑπομνήματα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, recalls the titles of Justin's Memoirs. Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 203 f., cf. *Proleg.*, p. liv. ff.: Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 213 ff.; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. cxviii.–cxlii., p. 487 ff.

[1] Luke i. 1; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 20, § 1; Origen, *Hom.* i. in *Lucam.* Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 3, 25, iv. 22, vi. 12; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*

[2] Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια. κ.τ.λ. *Apol.*, i. 66.

[3] An instance of such a gloss getting into the text occurs in *Dial.* 107, where in a reference to Jonah's prophecy that Nineveh should perish in three days, according to the version of the lxx. which Justin always quotes, there is a former marginal gloss "in other versions forty," incorporated parenthetically with the text.

[4] τὰ ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ παραγγέλματα. κ.τ.λ. *Dial. c. Tr.*, 10.

[5] *Dial.*, 100.

[6] There is one reference in the singular to the Gospel in the fragment *De Resurr.*, 10, which is of doubtful authenticity.

exclusively used by distinguished contemporaries of Justin, and by various communities of Christians in that day, could such an expression be taken as a special indication of the canonical Gospels.[1]

Describing the religious practices amongst Christians in another place, Justin states that, at their assemblies on Sundays, "the *Memoirs of the Apostles* or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits."[2] This, however, by no means identifies the Memoirs with the canonical Gospels, for it is well known that many writings which have been excluded from the canon were publicly read in the churches until very long after Justin's day. We have already met with several instances of this. Eusebius mentions that the Epistle of the Roman Clement was publicly read in churches in his time,[3] and he quotes an Epistle of Dionysius of Corinth to Soter, the Bishop of Rome, which states that fact for the purpose of "showing that it was the custom to read it in the churches, even from the earliest times."[4] Dionysius likewise mentions the public reading of the Epistle of Soter to the Corinthians. Epiphanius refers to the reading in the churches of the Epistle of Clement,[5] and it continued to be so read in Jerome's day.[6] In like manner the Shepherd of Hermas,[7] the "Apocalypse of Peter,"[8] and other works excluded from the canon, were publicly read in the church in early days.[9] It is certain that Gospels which did not permanently secure a place in the canon, such as the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel according to Peter, the Gospel of the Ebionites, and many kindred Gospels, which in

[1] Credner argues that, had Justin intended such a limitation, he must have said, ἃ καλεῖται τὰ τέσσαρα εὐαγγέλια. *Gesch. d. N. T. Kan.*, p. 10.

[2] τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ. *Apol.*, i. 67.

[3] *H. E.*, iii. 16.

[4] *H. E.*, iv. 23.

[5] *Hær.*, xxx. 15.

[6] *De Vir. Ill.*, 15....."*quæ in nonnullis ecclesiis publice legitur.*"

[7] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 3; Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 10.

[8] Sozom., *H. E.*, vii. 19; *Canon Murator.*, Tregelles, p, 56 f.

[9] The Shepherd of Hermas and the Apocalypse of Peter are enumerated amongst the books of Holy Scripture in the Stichometry of the *Codex Claramontanus* (ed. Tischendorf, p. 469; cf. Credner, *Gesch. N. T. Kan.*, p. 175 f.), and the latter is placed amongst the ἀντιλεγόμενα in the Stichometry of Nicephorus, together with the Apocalypse of John and the Gospel according to the Hebrews. (Credner, *Zur Gesch. d. Kan.*, p. 117 ff.) In the *Can. Murat.* the Apoc. of Peter is received along with that of John, although some object to its being read in the Church. (*Can. Murat.*, Tregelles, p. 65; Credner, *Gesch. N. T. Kan.*, p. 175 f.) Tischendorf conjectures that the Apocalypse of Peter may have been inserted between the Ep. of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas, where six pages are missing in the *Codex Sinaiticus*. (*Nov. Test. Sinait.*, Lipsiæ, 1863, *Proleg.*, p. xxxii.)

early times were exclusively used by various communities,[1] must have been read at their public assemblies. The public reading of Justin's Memoirs, therefore, does not prove anything, for this practice was by no means limited to the works now in our canon.

The idea of attributing inspiration to the Memoirs, or to any other work of the Apostles, with the single exception, as we shall presently see, of the Apocalypse of John,[2] which, as prophecy, entered within his limits, was quite foreign to Justin, who recognised the Old Testament alone as the inspired Word of God. Indeed, as we have already said, the very name "Memoirs" in itself excludes the thought of inspiration, which Justin attributed only to prophetic writings; and he could not in any way regard as inspired the written tradition of the Apostles and their followers, or a mere record of the words of Jesus. On the contrary, he held the accounts of the Apostles to be credible solely from their being authenticated by the Old Testament, and he clearly states that he believes the facts recorded in the Memoirs because the spirit of prophecy had already foretold them.[3] According to Justin, the Old Testament contained all that was necessary for salvation, and its prophecies are the sole criterion of truth—the Memoirs, and even Christ himself, being merely its interpreters.[4] He says that Christ commanded us not to put faith in human doctrines, but in those proclaimed by the holy prophets, and taught by himself.[5] Prophecy and the words of Christ himself are alone of dogmatic value; all else is human teaching. Indeed, from a passage quoted with approval by Irenæus, Justin, in his lost work against Marcion, said: "I would not have believed the Lord himself if he had proclaimed any other God than the Creator—that is to say, the God of the Old Testament."[6]

That Justin does not mention the name of the author of the Memoirs would, in any case, render any argument as to their identity with our canonical Gospels inconclusive; but the total omission to do so is the more remarkable from the circumstance that the names of Old Testament writers constantly occur in his

[1] Cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 26, § 2, iii., 11, § 7; Origen, *Comm. in Ezech.*, xxiv. 7; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 25, 27, vi. 12; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxix. 9, xxx. 3, 13 f.; Theodoret, *Hær. Fab.*, ii. 22; Hieron., *Adv. Pelag.*, iii. 2, *Comm. in Matth.*, xii. 13.

[2] *Dial. c. Tr.*, 81.

[3] *Apol.*, i. 33; cf. *Dial. c. Tr.*, 119, *Apol.*, i. 32, *Dial. c. Tr.*, 48, 53.

[4] Cf. *Apol.*, i. 30, 32, 52, 53, 61, *Dial. c. Tr.*, 32, 43, 48, 100.

[5] ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἀνθρωπείοις διδάγμασι κεκελεύσμεθα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πείθεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τοῖς διὰ τῶν μακαρίων προφητῶν κηρυχθεῖσι καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ διδαχθεῖσι. *Dial. c. Tr.*, 48.

[6] Καὶ καλῶς ὁ Ἰουστῖνος ἐν τῷ πρὸς Μαρκίωνα συντάγματί φησιν· Ὅτι αὐτῷ τῷ κυρίῳ οὐκ ἂν ἐπείσθην, ἄλλον θεὸν καταγγέλλοντι παρὰ τὸν δημιουργὸν..... *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 6, § 2. Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 18.

writings. Semisch counts 197 quotations of the Old Testament, in which Justin refers to the author by name, or to the book, and only 117 in which he omits to do so,[1] and the latter number might be reduced by considering the nature of the passages cited, and the inutility of repeating the reference.[2] When it is considered, therefore, that notwithstanding the numerous quotations and references to facts of Christian history, all purporting to be derived from the Memoirs, he absolutely never, except in the one instance referred to, mentions an author's name, or specifies more clearly the nature of the source, the inference must not only be that he attached small importance to the Memoirs, but also that he was actually ignorant of the author's name, and that his Gospel had no more definite superscription. Upon the theory that the *Memoirs of the Apostles* were simply our four canonical Gospels, the singularity of the omission is increased by the diversity of contents and of authors, and the consequently greater necessity and probability that he should, upon certain occasions, distinguish between them. The fact is that the only writing of the New Testament to which Justin refers by name is, as we have already mentioned, the Apocalypse, which he attributes to "a certain man whose name was John, one of the Apostles of Christ, who prophesied by a revelation made to him," etc.[3] The manner in which John is here mentioned, after the Memoirs had been so constantly indefinitely referred to, clearly shows that Justin did not possess any Gospel also attributed to John. That he does name John, however, as author of the Apocalypse, and so frequently refers to Old Testament writers by name, yet never identifies the author of the Memoirs, is quite irreconcilable with the idea that they were the canonical Gospels.

It is perfectly clear, however —and this is a point of very great importance, upon which critics of otherwise widely diverging views are agreed—that Justin quotes from a *written* source, and that oral tradition is excluded from his system. He not only does not, like Papias, attach value to tradition, but, on the contrary, he affirms that in the Memoirs is recorded "*everything* that concerns our

[1] Semisch, *Denkwürd. Justinus*, p. 84.

[2] It is not requisite that we should in detail refute the groundless argument that the looseness of Justin's quotations from the Old Testament justifies the assumption that his evangelical quotations, notwithstanding their disagreement and almost universal inaccuracy, are taken from our Gospels. Those, however, who desire to examine the theory further may be referred to Semisch, *Die ap. Denkw. d. Mart. Justinus*, pp. 239–273, and Bindemann, *Th. Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1842, p. 412 ff., on the affirmative side, and to its refutation by Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv.* Justin's, pp. 46–62, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, pp. 385–439, 567–578; and Credner, *Beiträge*, ii.

[3] Καὶ ἐπειδὴ καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνήρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἷς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένῃ αὐτῷ, κ.τ.λ. *Dial. c. Tr.*, 81.

Saviour Jesus Christ."[1] He constantly refers to them, directly, as the source of his information regarding the history of Jesus, and distinctly states that he has derived his quotations from them. There is no reasonable ground for affirming that Justin supplemented or modified the contents of the Memoirs by oral tradition. It must, therefore, be remembered, in considering the nature of these Memoirs, that the facts of Christian history and the sayings of Jesus are derived from a determinate written source, and are quoted as Justin found them there. Those who attempt to explain the divergences of Justin's quotations from the canonical Gospels, which they still maintain to have been his Memoirs, on the plea of oral tradition, defend the identity at the expense of the authority of the Gospels; for nothing could more forcibly show Justin's disregard and disrespect for the Gospels than would the fact that, possessing them, he not only never names their authors, but considers himself at liberty continually to contradict, modify, and revise their statements.

As we have already remarked, when we examine the contents of the *Memoirs of the Apostles* through Justin's numerous quotations, we find that many parts of the Gospel narratives are apparently quite unknown, whilst, on the other hand, we meet with facts of evangelical history which are foreign to the canonical Gospels, and others which are contradictory of Gospel statements. Justin's quotations, almost without exception, vary more or less from the parallels in the canonical text, and often these variations are consistently repeated by himself, and are found in other works about his time. Moreover, Justin quotes expressions of Jesus which are not found in our Gospels at all. The omissions, though often very singular, supposing the canonical Gospels before him, and almost inexplicable when it is considered how important they would often have been to his argument, need not, as merely negative evidence, be dwelt on here; but we shall briefly illustrate the other peculiarities of Justin's quotations.

The only genealogy of Jesus which is recognised by Justin is traced through the Virgin Mary. She it is who is descended from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and from the house of David, and Joseph is completely set aside.[2] Jesus "was born of a virgin of the lineage of Abraham and tribe of Judah and of David, Christ, the Son of God."[3] "Jesus Christ, the Son of God, has been

[1] οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξαν. *Apol.*, i. 33.

[2] *Dial. c. Tr.* 23, 43 twice, 45 thrice, 100 twice, 101, 120, *Apol.*, i. 32; cf. Matt. i. 1–16; Luke iii. 23–28.

[3] εἰς τὸν διὰ τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ φυλῆς Ἰούδα, καὶ Δαβὶδ παρθένου γεννηθέντα υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστόν. *Dial. c. Tr.*, 43.

born without sin, of a virgin sprung from the lineage of Abraham."[1] "For of the virgin of the seed of Jacob, who was the father of Judah, who, as we have shown, was the father of the Jews, by the power of God was he conceived; and Jesse was his forefather according to the prophecy, and he (Jesus) was the son of Jacob and Judah according to successive descent."[2] The genealogy of Jesus in the canonical Gospels, on the contrary, is traced solely through Joseph, who alone is stated to be of the lineage of David.[3] The genealogies of Matthew and Luke, though differing in several important points, at least agree in excluding Mary. That of the third Gospel commences with Joseph, and that of the first ends with him: "And Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ."[4] The angel who warns Joseph not to put away his wife addresses him as "Joseph, thou son of David";[5] and the angel Gabriel, who, according to the third Gospel, announces to Mary the supernatural conception, is sent "to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David."[6] So persistent, however, is Justin in ignoring this Davidic descent through Joseph that not only does he at least eleven times trace it through Mary, but his Gospel materially differs from the canonical, where the descent of Joseph from David is mentioned by the latter. In the third Gospel Joseph goes to Judæa, "unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and lineage of David."[7] Justin, however, simply states that he went "to Bethlehem.....for his descent was from the tribe of Judah, which inhabited that region."[8] There can be no doubt that Justin not only did not derive his genealogies from the canonical Gospels, but that, on the contrary, the Memoirs, from which he did learn the Davidic descent through Mary only, differed persistently and materially from them.

Many traces still exist to show that the view of Justin's *Memoirs of the Apostles* of the Davidic descent of Jesus through Mary instead of through Joseph, as the canonical Gospels represent it, was anciently held in the Church. Apocryphal Gospels of early date, based without doubt upon more ancient evangelical works, are still extant, in which the genealogy of Jesus is traced, as in Justin's Memoirs, through Mary. One of these is the Gospel of James, commonly called the *Protevangelium*, a work referred to by ecclesiastical writers of the third and fourth centuries,[9] and which Tischendorf even ascribes to the first three

[1] *Dial. c. Tr.*, 23. [2] *Apol.*, i. 32. [3] Matt. i. 1–16; cf. Luke iii. 23–28.
[4] Matt. i. 16; cf. Luke iii. 23. [5] Matt. i. 20. [6] Luke i. 27.
[7] Luke ii. 4. [8] *Dial. c. Tr.*, 78.
[9] Clemens, Al., *Strom.*, vii. 16, § 93; Origen, *Comm. in Matth.* iii.; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, lxxix., § 5; cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 39 ff.; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T. proleg.*, xlv. ff.

decades of the second century,[1] in which Mary is stated to be of the lineage of David.[2] She is also described as of the royal race and family of David in the Gospel of the Nativity of Mary ;[3] and in the Gospel of pseudo-Matthew her Davidic descent is prominently mentioned.[4] There can be no doubt that all of these works are based upon earlier originals,[5] and there is no reason why they may not have been drawn from the same source from which Justin derived his version of the genealogy in contradiction to the Synoptics.[6]

In the narrative of the events which preceded the birth of Jesus, the first Gospel describes the angel as appearing only to Joseph and explaining the supernatural conception,[7] and the author seems to know nothing of any announcement to Mary.[8] The third Gospel, on the contrary, does not mention any such angelic appearance to Joseph, but represents the angel as announcing the conception to Mary herself alone.[9] Justin's Memoirs know of the appearances, both to Joseph and to Mary ; but the words spoken by the angel on each occasion differ materially from those of both Gospels.[10] In this place only one point, however, can be noticed. Justin describes the angel as

[1] *Wann wurden u. s. w.*, p. 76 ff., cf. *Evangelia Apocr. Proleg.*, p. xii. ff.

[2] Καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ ἱερεὺς τῆς παιδὸς Μαριάμ, ὅτι ἦν ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Δαβίδ, κ.τ.λ. *Protevangelium Jacobi*, x. Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocr.*, p. 19 f. ; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 90.

[3] .....*Maria de stirpe regia et familia David oriunda. Evang. de Nativ. Mariæ*, i. ; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 19 ; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 106.

[4] *Pseudo-Matth. Evang.*, i., xiii., etc. ; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 54, 73 ; cf. *Hist. de Nativ. Mar. et de Inf. Salv.*, xiii ; Thilo, *Cod. ap. N. T.*, p. 374. Regarding the antiquity of some of these works, cf. Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr. Proleg.*, p. xxv. ff.

[5] Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 154 ff. Hilgenfeld conjectures that the *Protevangelium* may have been based upon the Gnostic work, the Γέννα Μαρίας mentioned by Epiphanius, or on the Gospel according to Peter, *ib.*, p. 159 ff. ; cf. Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 84 ff. ; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 78 ff.

[6] Several of the Fathers in like manner assert the Davidic descent through Mary. Irenæus states that she was "of the lineage of David" (οὗτός ἐστιν ἐκ τῆς Δαβὶδ παρθένου γενόμενος. *Adv. Hær.*, iii., 21, § 5), and he argues that the Davidic descent through the Virgin was clearly indicated by prophecy. The same argument is taken up by Tertullian, who distinctly traces the descent of Christ through Mary (*ex stirpe autem Jesse deputatum per Mariam inde censendum. Adv. Marcionem*, iii. 17. *Eundem ex genere David secundum Mariæ censum, Ib.*, iv. 1, cf. v. 8). It is most probable that both Irenæus and Tertullian, who were well acquainted with the writings of Justin, followed him in this matter, for they very closely adopt his arguments. They may, however, have known apocryphal works containing the Davidic descent through Mary. They certainly did not derive it from the canonical Gospels.

[7] Matt. i. 20 f. [8] Cf. Matt. i. 18. [9] Luke i. 26 f., cf. ii. 5–6.

[10] *Apol.*, i. 33, *Dial. c. Tr.*, 78, 100.

saying to Mary, "'Behold, thou shalt conceive of the Holy Ghost, and shalt bear a son, and he shall be called the Son of the Highest, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins,' as they taught who recorded everything that concerns our Saviour Jesus Christ."[1] Now, this is a clear and direct quotation, but, besides distinctly differing in form from our Gospels, it presents the important peculiarity that the words, "for he shall save his people from their sins," are not, in Luke, addressed to Mary at all, but that they occur in the first Gospel in the address of the angel to Joseph.[2]

These words, however, are not accidentally inserted in this place, for we find that they are joined in the same manner to the address of the angel to Mary in the *Protevangelium* of James: "For the power of the Lord will overshadow thee; wherefore also that holy thing which is born of thee shall be called the Son of the Highest, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins."[3] Tischendorf states his own opinion that this passage is a recollection of the *Protevangelium* unconsciously added by Justin to the account in Luke,[4] but the arbitrary nature of the limitation "unconsciously" (*ohne dass er sich dessen bewusst war*) here is evident. There is a point in connection with this which merits a moment's attention. In the text of the *Protevangelium*, edited by Tischendorf, the angel commences his address to Mary by saying, "Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favour before the Lord, and thou shalt conceive of His Word" (*καὶ συλλήψῃ ἐκ λόγου αὐτοῦ*).[5] Now, Justin, after quoting the passage above, continues to argue that the Spirit and the power of God must not be misunderstood to mean anything else than the Word, who is also the first-born of God, as the prophet Moses declared; and it was this which, when it came upon the Virgin and overshadowed her, caused her to conceive.[6] The occurrence of the singular expression in the *Protevangelium*

[1] Ἰδοὺ συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν, καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται· καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν· ὡς οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξαν. *Apol.*, i. 33.

[2] Matt. i. 21.

[3] Δύναμις γὰρ κυρίου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἐκ σοῦ ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς ὑψίστου· καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν. αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. *Protev. Jacobi*, xi.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 22; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 93.

[4] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 77.

[5] *Protev. Jac.*, xi.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 21 f. The peculiar expression is wanting in most of the other known MSS.

[6] Τὸ πνεῦμα οὖν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδὲν ἄλλο νοῆσαι θέμις ἢ τὸν λόγον, ὃς καὶ πρωτότοκος τῷ θεῷ ἐστι, ὡς Μωσῆς ὁ προδεδηλωμένος προφήτης ἐμήνυσε. Καὶ τοῦτο, ἐλθὸν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον καὶ ἐπισκιάσαν, κ.τ.λ. *Apol.*, i. 33.

and the similar explanation of Justin immediately accompanying a variation from our Gospels, which is equally shared by the apocryphal work, strengthens the suspicion of a similarity of origin. Justin's divergences from the *Protevangelium* prevent our supposing that, in its present state, it could have been the actual source of his quotations; but the wide differences which exist between the extant MSS. of the *Protevangelium* show that even the most ancient does not present it in its original form. It is much more probable that Justin had before him a still older work, to which both the *Protevangelium* and the third Gospel were indebted.

Justin's account of the removal of Joseph to Bethlehem is peculiar, and evidently is derived from a distinct uncanonical source. It may be well to present his account and that of Luke side by side:—

Justin. Dial. c. Tr. 78.	Luke ii. 1–5.
On the occasion of the first census which was taken *in Judæa* (ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ)	1.....there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that *all the world* (πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην) should be enrolled.
under Cyrenius (*first Procurator* (ἐπίτροπος) *of Judæa. Apol.*, i. 34), Joseph had gone up from Nazareth, where he dwelt,	2. And this census was first made when Cyrenius was *Governor* (ἡγεμών) *of Syria.* 4. And Joseph went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth into Judæa, *unto the City of David*, which is called Bethlehem;
to Bethlehem, from whence he was, to enrol himself;	because he was of the house and lineage of David; 5. to enrol himself.
for his descent was from the tribe of Judah, which inhabited that region.	

Attention has already been drawn to the systematic manner in which the Davidic descent of Jesus is traced by Justin through Mary, and to the suppression in this passage of all that might seem to indicate a claim of descent through Joseph. As the continuation of a peculiar representation of the history of the infancy of Jesus, differing materially from that of the Synoptics, it is impossible to regard this, with its remarkable variations, as an arbitrary correction by Justin of the canonical text, and we must hold it to be derived from a different source—perhaps, indeed, one of those from which Luke's Gospel itself first drew the elements of the narrative; and this persuasion increases as further variations in the earlier history, presently to be considered, are taken into account. It is not necessary to enter into the question of the correctness of the date of this census, but it is evident that Justin's Memoirs clearly and deliberately modify the canonical narrative. The limitation of the census to Judea, instead of extending it to the whole Roman Empire; the designation of Cyrenius as

ἐπίτροπος of Judæa instead of ἡγεμών of Syria; and the careful suppression of the Davidic element in connection with Joseph, indicate a peculiar written source different from the Synoptics.

Had Justin departed from the account in Luke with the view of correcting inaccurate statements, the matter might have seemed more consistent with the use of the third Gospel, although, at the same time, it might have evinced but little reverence for it as a canonical work. On the contrary, however, the statements of Justin are still more inconsistent with history than those in Luke, inasmuch as, so far from being the first Procurator of Judea, as Justin's narrative states in opposition to the third Gospel, Cyrenius never held that office, but was really, later, the imperial proconsul over Syria, and, as such, when Judæa became a Roman province after the banishment of Archelaus, had the power to enrol the inhabitants, and instituted Caponius as first Procurator of Judæa. Justin's statement involves the position that at one and the same time Herod was the King, and Cyrenius the Roman Procurator of Judæa.[1] In the same spirit, and departing from the usual narrative of the Synoptics, which couples the birth of Jesus with "the days of Herod the King," Justin, in another place, states that Christ was born "under Cyrenius."[2] Justin evidently adopts, without criticism, a narrative which he found in his Memoirs, and does not merely correct and remodel a passage of the third Gospel, but, on the contrary, seems altogether ignorant of it.

The genealogies of Jesus in the first and third Gospels differ irreconcileably from each other. Justin differs from both. In this passage another discrepancy arises. While Luke seems to represent Nazareth as the dwelling-place of Joseph and Mary, and Bethlehem as the city to which they went solely on account of the census,[3] Matthew, who appears to know nothing of the census, makes Bethlehem, on the contrary, the place of residence of Joseph;[4] and, on coming back from Egypt, with the evident intention of returning to Bethlehem, Joseph is warned by a dream to turn aside into Galilee, and he goes and dwells—apparently for the first time—"in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets: He shall be called a Nazarene."[5] Justin, however, goes still further than the third Gospel in his

[1] Cf. Joseph., *Antiq.*, xviii. 1, § 1; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 19.
[2] *Apol.*, i. 46. [3] Luke ii. 4.
[4] Matt. ii. 1; cf. Alford, *Greek Test.*, i., p. 14.
[5] Matt. ii. 22 f. It is scarcely necessary to point out that the author of the first Gospel quotes some apocryphal work, and that the last word is a total misconception of the phrase. The word Ναζωραῖος should have been Ναζιραῖος, and the term has nothing whatever to do with the town of Nazareth.

departure from the data of Matthew, and where Luke merely infers, Justin distinctly asserts Nazareth to have been the dwelling-place of Joseph (ἔνθα ᾤκει), and Bethlehem, in contradistinction, the place from which he derived his origin (ὅθεν ἦν).

The same view is to be found in several apocryphal Gospels still extant. In the *Protevangelium* of James, again, we find Joseph journeying to Bethlehem with Mary before the birth of Jesus.[1] The census here is ordered by Augustus, who commands: "That all who were in Bethlehem *of Judæa* should be enrolled,"[2] a limitation worthy of notice in comparison with that of Justin. In like manner the Gospel of the Nativity. This Gospel represents the parents of Mary as living in Nazareth, in which place she was born,[3] and it is here that the angel Gabriel announces to her the supernatural conception.[4] Joseph goes to Bethlehem to set his house in order and prepare what is necessary for the marriage, but then returns to Nazareth, where he remains with Mary until her time was nearly accomplished,[5] "when Joseph, having taken his wife, with whatever else was necessary, went to the city of Bethlehem, whence he was."[6] The phrase "*unde ipse erat*" recalls the ὅθεν ἦν of Justin.[7]

As we continue the narrative of the birth and infancy of Jesus we meet with further variations from the account in the canonical Gospels for which the preceding have prepared us, and which indicate that Justin's Memoirs certainly differed from them.

Justin. Dial. 78.	Luke ii. 7.
But the child having been born in Bethlehem—for Joseph, not being able to find a lodging in the village, lodged in a certain cave near the village, and then while they were there Mary had brought forth the Christ and had placed him in a manger, etc.	And she brought forth her first-born son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes and laid him in the manger; because there was no room in the inn.

[1] *Protev. Jac.*, xvii., cf. xxi.; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 103; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 30, p. 39.

[2] Κέλευσις δὲ ἐγένετο ἀπὸ Αὐγούστου βασιλέως ἀπογράφεσθαι πάντας τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας. *Protev. Jac.*, xvii.

[3] *Evang. de Nativ. Mariæ*, i. and viii.; cf. *Evang. Thomæ Lat.*, iii.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 158.

[4] *Ev. de Nat. Mariæ*, ix. [5] *Ib.*, viii., ix.

[6] *Joseph, uxore cum aliis quæ necessaria erant assumta Bethlehem civitatem, unde ipse erat, tetendit. Evang. de Nat. Mar.*, x.; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 37; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 114, cf. *Evang. infantiæ Arab.*, ii.; Fabricius, *ib.*, i., p. 169; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 171. Here Joseph goes from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, his native city.

[7] Cf. *Hist. de Nat. Mar. et de Inf. Salv.*, xiii. "*Necesse autem fuerat, ut et Joseph cum Maria proficisceretur in Bethlehem, quia exinde erat, et Maria de tribu Juda et de domo ac patria David.*" Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 374.

At least it is clear that these particulars of the birth of Jesus—not taking place in Bethlehem itself, but in a cave (ἐν σπηλαίῳ) near the village, because Joseph could not find a lodging there—are not derived from our Gospels; and here even Semisch[1] is forced to abandon his theory that Justin's variations arise merely from imperfectly quoting from memory, and to conjecture that he must have adopted tradition. It has, however, been shown that Justin himself distinctly excludes tradition, and in this case, moreover, there are many special reasons for believing that he quotes from a written source. Ewald rightly points out that here, and in other passages where, in common with ancient ecclesiastical writers, Justin departs from our Gospels, the variation can in no way be referred to oral tradition;[2] and, moreover, that when Justin proves[3] from Isaiah xxxiii. 16 that Christ *must* be born in a cave, he thereby shows how certainly he found the fact of the cave in his written Gospel.[4] The whole argument of Justin excludes the idea that he could avail himself of mere tradition. He maintains that everything which the prophets had foretold of Christ had actually been fulfilled, and he perpetually refers to the Memoirs and other written documents for the verification of his assertions. He either refers to the prophets for the confirmation of the Memoirs or shows in the Memoirs the narrative of facts which are the accomplishment of prophecies; but in both cases it is manifest that there must have been a record of the facts which he mentions. There can be no doubt that the circumstances we have just quoted, and which are not found in the canonical Gospels, must have been narrated in Justin's Memoirs.

We find, again, the same variations as in Justin in several extant apocryphal Gospels. The *Protevangelium* of James represents the birth of Jesus as taking place in a cave;[5] so, also, the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy,[6] and several others.[7] This uncanonical detail is also mentioned by several of the Fathers, Origen and Eusebius both stating that the cave and the manger were still shown in their day.[8] Tischendorf does not hesitate to

[1] *Denkwürdigk. d. Märt. Just.*, p. 390 f.
[2] *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss*, 1853–54, p. 60.
[3] *Dial.* 71, cf. 70. [4] *Ib.*, p. 60, anm. 1.
[5] *Protev. Jac.*, xviii.; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 105; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 32.
[6] *Evang. Infantiæ Arab.*, ii., iii.; Fabricius, *ib.*, i., p. 169 f.; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 171 f.
[7] *Pseudo-Matt. Ev.*, xiii., xiv.; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 74 f.; *Historia Josephi Fab. Lign.*, vii.; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 118; *Hist. de Nat. Mar. et de Inf. Salv.*, xiv.; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 381.
[8] Origen, *Contra Cels.*, i. 51; Eusebius, *Vita Const.*, iii. 40 f. Their only variation from Justin's account is, that they speak of the cave as in Bethlehem, while Justin describes it as near the village. Credner remarks that

affirm that Justin derived this circumstance from the *Protevangelium*.[1] Justin, however, does not distinguish such a source; and the mere fact that we have still extant a form of that Gospel in which it occurs by no means justifies such a specific conclusion, when so many other works, now lost, may equally have contained it. If the fact be derived from the *Protevangelium*, that work, or whatever other apocryphal Gospel may have supplied it, must be admitted to have at least formed part of the *Memoirs of the Apostles*, and with that necessary admission ends all special identification of the Memoirs with our canonical Gospels. Much more probably, however, Justin quotes from the more ancient source from which the *Protevangelium* and, perhaps, Luke drew their narrative. There can be very little doubt that the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained an account of the birth in Bethlehem, and, as it is at least certain that Justin quotes other particulars known to have been in it, there is fair reason to suppose that he likewise found this fact in that work. In any case, it is indisputable that he derived it from a source different from our canonical Gospels.

Justin does not apparently know anything of the episode of the shepherds of the plain, and the angelic appearance to them, narrated in the third Gospel.[2]

To the cave in which the infant Jesus is born came the Magi; but, instead of employing the phrase used by the first Gospel, "Magi from the East"[3] (μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν), Justin always describes them as "Magi from Arabia" (μάγοι ἀπὸ Ἀραβίας). Justin is so punctilious that he never speaks of these Magi without adding "from Arabia," except twice, where, however, he immediately mentions Arabia as the point of the argument for which they are introduced; and in the same chapter in which this occurs he four times calls them directly Magi from Arabia.[4] He uses this expression not less than nine times.[5] That he had no objection to the term "the East," and that with a different context it was common to his vocabulary, is proved by his use of it elsewhere.[6] It is impossible to resist the conviction that Justin's Memoirs contained the phrase, "Magi from Arabia," which is foreign to our Gospels.

the sacredness of the spot might by that time have attracted people, and led to the extension of the town in that direction, till the site might have become really joined to Bethlehem. Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 235, cf. Socrates, *H. E.*, i. 17; Sozomen, *H. E.*, ii. 2; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xx. 1; Hieron., *Ep.*, lviii., ad Paul.

[1] *Evang. Apocr. Proleg.*, p. xiii., *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 76 ff.

[2] Luke ii. 8, 20. [3] Matt. ii. 1. [4] *Dial. c. Tr.*, 78.

[5] *Dial.* 77, 78 four times, 88, 102, 103, 106.

[6] *Dial.* 76, 120, 121, 126, 140, etc.; cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 149.

Again, according to Justin, the Magi see the star "in the heaven" (ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ),[1] and not "in the East" (ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ), as the first Gospel has it:[2] "When a star rose in heaven (ἐν οὐρανῷ) at the time of his birth, as is recorded in the *Memoirs of the Apostles*."[3]. He apparently knows nothing of the star guiding them to the place where the young child was.[4] Herod, moreover, questions the elders (πρεσβύτεροι)[5] as to the place where the Christ should be born, and not the "chief priests and scribes of the people" (ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ).[6] These divergences, taken in connection with those which are interwoven with the whole narrative of the birth, can only proceed from the fact that Justin quotes from a source different from ours.

Justin relates that when Jesus came to Jordan he was believed to be the son of Joseph, the carpenter, and he appeared without comeliness, as the Scriptures announced; "and being considered a carpenter—for, when he was amongst men, he made carpenter's works, ploughs, and yokes (ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά); by these both teaching the symbols of righteousness and an active life."[7] These details are foreign to the canonical Gospels. Mark has the expression, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?"[8] but Luke omits it altogether.[9] The idea that the Son of God should do carpenter's work on earth was very displeasing to many Christians, and attempts to get rid of the obnoxious phrase are evident in Mark. Apparently the copy which Origen used had omitted even the modified phrase, for he declares that Jesus himself is nowhere called a carpenter in the Gospels current in the Church.[10] A few MSS. are still extant without it, although it is found in all the more ancient Codices.

Traces of these details are found in several apocryphal works; especially in the Gospel of Thomas, where it is said: "Now, his father was a carpenter, and made at that time ploughs and yokes" (ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγούς)[11]—an account which, from the similarity of

[1] *Dial.* 106. [2] Matt. ii. 2, cf. ii. 9. [3] *Dial.* 106.
[4] Matt. ii. 9. [5] *Dial.* 78. [6] Matt. ii. 4.
[7] .....καὶ τέκτονος νομιζομένου ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἔργα εἰργάζετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὢν, ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά· διὰ τούτων καὶ τὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σύμβολα διδάσκων, καὶ ἐνεργῆ βίον. *Dial.* 88.
[8] οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς Μαρίας; Mark vi. 3.
[9] Cf. Luke iii. 23.
[10] .....ὅτι οὐδαμοῦ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις φερομένων εὐαγγελίων τέκτων αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀναγέγραπται. *Contra Cels.*, vi. 36; cf. Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 239; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 152.
[11] Ὁ δὲ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ τέκτων ἦν, καὶ ἐποίει ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγούς. *Evang. Thomæ Græce*, A. xiii.; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 144 cf.; *Evang. Thomæ Lat.*, xi.; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 166; *Pseudo-Matth. Ev.*, xxxvii.; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 99; *Evang. Infant. Arab.*, xxxviii.; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 193; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 200.

language, was in all probability derived from the same source as that of Justin. The explanation which Justin adds, "by which he taught the symbols of righteousness and an active life," seems to indicate that he refers to a written narrative containing the detail, already, perhaps, falling into sufficient disfavour to require the aid of symbolical interpretation.

In the narrative of the baptism there are many peculiarities which prove that Justin did not derive it from our Gospels. Thrice he speaks of John sitting by the river Jordan: "He cried as he sat by the river Jordan";[1] "While he still sat by the river Jordan";[2] and "For when John sat by the Jordan."[3] This peculiar expression, so frequently repeated, must have been derived from a written Gospel. Then Justin, in proving that Jesus predicted his second coming, and the reappearance of Elijah, states: "And therefore our Lord, in his teaching, announced that this should take place, saying Elias also should come" (*εἰπὼν καὶ Ἠλίαν ἐλεύσεσθαι*). A little lower down he again expressly quotes the words of Jesus: "For which reason our Christ declared on earth to those who asserted that Elias must come before Christ: Elias, indeed, shall come," etc. (*Ἠλίας μὲν ἐλεύσεται, κ.τ.λ.*).[4] Matthew, however, reads: "Elias indeed cometh," *Ἠλίας μὲν ἔρχεται, κ.τ.λ.*[5] Now, there is no version in which *ἐλεύσεται* is substituted for *ἔρχεται* as Justin does; but, as Credner has pointed out,[6] the whole weight of Justin's argument lies in the use of the future tense. As there are so many other variations in Justin's context, this likewise appears to be derived from a source different from our Gospels.

When Jesus goes to be baptised by John many striking peculiarities occur in Justin's narrative: "As Jesus went down to the water a fire also was kindled in the Jordan; and when he came up from the water the Holy Spirit, like a dove, fell upon him, as the apostles of this very Christ of ours wrote.....and at the same time a voice came from the heavens.....Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee."[7]

The incident of the fire in Jordan is, of course, quite foreign to our Gospels; and, further, the words spoken by the heavenly voice differ from those reported by them, for, instead of the passage

[1] *ὅστις ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν καθεζόμενος, ἐβόα· κ.τ.λ. Dial.* 49.
[2] *ἔτι αὐτοῦ καθεζομένου ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ποταμοῦ, κ.τ.λ. Dial.* 51.
[3] *Ἰωάννου γὰρ καθεζομένου ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, κ.τ.λ. Dial.* 88.
[4] *Dial.* 49. [5] xvii. 11. Many MSS. add *πρῶτον*. [6] *Beiträge*, i., p. 219.
[7] .....*κατελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πῦρ ἀνήφθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ· καὶ ἀναδύντος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, ὡς περιστερὰν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐπιπτῆναι ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔγραψαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν.....καὶ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἅμα ἐληλύθει..... "Τίός μου εἶ σύ· ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε." Dial.* 88.

from Psalm ii. 7, the Gospels have: "Thou art my beloved son; in thee I am well pleased."[1] Justin repeats his version a second time in the same chapter, and again elsewhere he says, regarding the temptation: "For this devil also, at the time when he (Jesus) went up from the river Jordan, when the voice declared to him: 'Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee,' it is written in the *Memoirs of the Apostles*, came to him and tempted him," etc.[2]

In both of these passages it will be perceived that Justin directly refers to the *Memoirs of the Apostles* as the source of his statements. Some have argued that Justin only appeals to them for the fact of the descent of the Holy Ghost, and not for the rest of the narrative. It has of course been felt that, if it can be shown that Justin quotes from the Memoirs words and circumstances which are not to be found in our canonical Gospels, the identity of the two can no longer be maintained. It is, however, in the highest degree arbitrary to affirm that Justin intends to limit his appeal to the testimony of the apostles to one-half of his sentence. To quote authority for one assertion, and to leave another in the same sentence, closely connected with it and part indeed of the very same narrative, not only unsupported, but weakened by direct exclusion, would indeed be singular, for Justin affirms with equal directness and confidence the fact of the fire in Jordan, the descent of the Holy Ghost, and the words spoken by the heavenly voice. If, in the strictest grammatical accuracy, there be no absolute necessity to include in the quotation more than the phrase immediately preceding, there is not, on the other hand, anything which requires or warrants the exclusion of the former part of the sentence. The matter must therefore be decided according to fair inference and reasonable probability; and these, as well as all the evidence concerning Justin's use of the Memoirs, irresistibly point to the conclusion that the whole passage is derived from one source. In the second extract given above it is perfectly clear that the words spoken by the heavenly voice, which Justin again quotes, and which are not in our Gospels, were recorded in the Memoirs, for Justin could not have referred to them for an account of the temptation at the time when Jesus went up from Jordan and the voice said to him, "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee," if these facts and words were not recorded in them at all.[3] It is impossible to doubt, after

[1] Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα. Mark i. 11, Luke iii. 22. The first Gospel has a slight variation: "This is my son, etc., in whom, etc.," Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου κ.τ.λ.....ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα. Matt. iii. 17; cf. 2 Peter i. 17, which agrees with Matt.

[2] *Dial.* 103.

[3] *Ib.* 103. The quotations regarding the temptation do not agree with our Gospels, but they will be referred to later.

impartial consideration, that the incident of the fire in Jordan, the words spoken by the voice from heaven, and the temptation were taken from the same source: they must collectively be referred to the Memoirs.

Of one thing we may be sure: had Justin known the form of words used by the voice from heaven according to our Gospels, he would certainly have made use of it in preference to that which he actually found in his Memoirs. He is arguing that Christ is pre-existing God, become incarnate by God's will through the Virgin Mary, and Trypho demands how he can be demonstrated to have been pre-existent, who is said to be filled with the power of the Holy Ghost, as though he had required this. Justin replies that these powers of the Spirit have come upon him, not because he had need of them, but because they would accomplish Scripture, which declared that after him there should be no prophet.[1] The proof of this, he continues, is that, as soon as the child was born, the Magi from Arabia came to worship him, because even at his birth he was in possession of his power,[2] and after he had grown up like other men by the use of suitable means, he came to the river Jordan, where John was baptising, and as he went into the water a fire was kindled in the Jordan, and the Holy Ghost descended like a dove. He did not go to the river because he had any need of baptism or of the descent of the Spirit, but because of the human race which had fallen under the power of death. Now if, instead of the passage actually cited, Justin could have quoted the words addressed to Jesus by the voice from heaven according to the Gospels: "Thou art my beloved son; in thee I am well pleased," his argument would have been greatly strengthened by such direct recognition of an already existing, and, as he affirmed, pre-existent, divinity in Jesus. Not having these words in his *Memoirs of the Apostles*, however, he was obliged to be content with those which he found there: "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee"—words which, in fact, destroyed the argument for pre-existence, and dated the divine begetting of Jesus as the son of God that very day. The passage, indeed, supported those who actually asserted that the Holy Ghost first entered into Jesus at his baptism. These considerations, and the repeated quotation of the same words in the same form, make it clear that Justin quotes from a source different from our Gospel.

In the scanty fragments of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" which have been preserved, we find both the incident of the fire kindled in Jordan and the words of the heavenly voice as quoted by Justin. "And as he went up from the water the heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit of God in the

[1] *Dial.* 87. [2] Καὶ γὰρ γεννηθείς, δύναμιν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἔσχε. *Dial.* 88.

form of a dove which came down and entered into him. And a voice came from heaven saying: 'Thou art my beloved son; in thee I am well pleased'; and again: 'This day have I begotten thee.' And immediately a great light shone round about the place."[1] Epiphanius extracts this passage from the version in use among the Ebionites, but it is well known that there were many other varying forms of the same Gospel; and Hilgenfeld,[2] with all probability, conjectures that the version known to Epiphanius was no longer in the same purity as that used by Justin, but represents the transition stage to the canonical Gospels -adopting the words of the voice which they give without yet discarding the older form. Jerome gives another form of the words from the version in use amongst the Nazarenes: "Factum est autem cum ascendisset Dominus de aquâ, descendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti et requievit super eum, et dixit illi: Fili mi, in omnibus Prophetis expectabam te ut venires et requiescerem in te, tu es enim requies mea, tu es filius meus primogenitus qui regnas in sempiternum."[3] This supports Justin's reading. Regarding the Gospel according to the Hebrews more must be said hereafter, but when it is remembered that Justin, a native of Samaria, probably first knew Christianity through believers in Syria, to whose Jewish view of Christianity he all his life adhered, and that these Christians almost exclusively used this Gospel[4] under various forms and names, it is reasonable to suppose that he also, like them, knew and made use of it—a supposition increased almost to certainty when it is found that Justin quotes words and facts foreign to the canonical Gospels which are known to have been contained in it. The argument of Justin, that Jesus did not need baptism, may also be compared to another passage of the Gospel according to the Hebrews preserved by Jerome, and which preceded the circumstances narrated above, in which the mother and brethren of Jesus say to him that John the Baptist is baptising for the remission of sins, and propose that they should go to be baptised by him. Jesus replies: "In what way have I sinned that I should go and be baptised by him?"[5] The most competent critics agree that

[1] Καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, ἠνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς κατελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν. Καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, λέγουσα, Σύ μου εἶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ ἠυδόκησα· καὶ πάλιν, Ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. Καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα. Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxx. 13.

[2] *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 165 f., anm. 1. [3] Hieron., *Comm. in Esaiæ*, xi. 2.

[4] Origen, *Comment. in Ezech.*, xxiv. 7; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxx. 3; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 27; Hieron., *Adv. Pelag.*, iii. 1 f.

[5] *Ecce mater Domini et fratres ejus dicebant ei: Johannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum, eamus et baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis: Quid peccavi ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? Nisi forte hoc ipsum, quod dixi, ignorantia est.* Hieron., *Adv. Pelag.*, iii. 2.

Justin derived the incidents of the fire in Jordan and the words spoken by the heavenly voice from the Gospel according to the Hebrews or some kindred work, and there is every probability that the numerous other quotations in his works differing from our Gospels are taken from the same source.

The incident of the fire in Jordan likewise occurs in the ancient work, *Prædicatio Pauli*,[1] coupled with a context which forcibly recalls the passage of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which has just been quoted, and apparent allusions to it are found in the Sibylline Books and early Christian literature.[2] Credner has pointed out that the marked use which was made of fire or lights at Baptism by the Church, during early times, probably rose out of this tradition regarding the fire which appeared in Jordan at the baptism of Jesus.[3] The peculiar form of words used by the heavenly voice according to Justin and to the Gospel according to the Hebrews was also known to several of the Fathers.[4] Augustine mentions that some MSS. in his time contained that reading in Luke iii. 22, although without the confirmation of more ancient Greek codices.[5] It is still extant in the *Codex Bezæ* (D). The Itala version adds to Matt. iii. 15: "and when he was baptised a great light shone round from the water, so that all who had come were afraid" (*et cum baptizaretur, lumen ingens circumfulsit de aqua, ita ut timerent omnes qui advenerant*); and again at Luke iii. 22 it gives the words of the voice in a form agreeing, at least, in sense with those which Justin found in his *Memoirs of the Apostles*.

These circumstances point with certainty to an earlier original corresponding with Justin, in all probability the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and to the subsequent gradual elimination of the passage from the Gospels finally adopted by the Church for dogmatic reasons, as various sects based on it doctrines which were at variance with the ever-enlarging belief of the majority.

Then Justin states that the men of his time asserted that the miracles of Jesus were performed by magical art (μαγικὴ)

[1] *In quo libro contra omnes Scripturas et de peccato proprio confitentem invenies Christum, qui solus omnino nihil deliquit, et ad accipiendum Joannis baptisma pene invitum a matre sua Maria esse compulsum: item, cum baptizaretur, ignem super aquam esse visum. Quod in Evangelio nullo est scriptum. Auctor tract. de Rebaptismate:* Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr.*, i., p. 800.

[2] *Sibyll Oracula*, lib., vii., viii.

[3] Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 237; cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 167 f.; Volkmar, *Die Evangelien*, p. 43.

[4] Clemens Al., *Pædag.*, i. 6; Methodius, *Conviv. Virg.*, ix. Lactantius, *Instit. Div.*, iv. 15; Augustine, *Enchirid. ad Laurent.*, 49.

[5] *Illud vero, quod nonnulli codices habent secundum Lucam, hoc illa voce sonuisse, quod in Psalmo scriptum est: Filius meus es tu; ego hodie genui te: quamquam in antiquioribus codicibus græcis non inveniri perhibeatur*, etc. *De Consensu Evang.*, ii. 14.

φαντασία), "for they ventured to call him a magician and deceiver of the people."[1] This cannot be accepted as a mere version of the charge that Jesus cast out demons by Beelzebub, but must have been found by Justin in his Memoirs. In the Gospel of Nicodemus or *Acta Pilati* the Jews accuse Jesus before Pilate of being a magician,[2] coupled with the assertion that he casts out demons through Beelzebub, the prince of the demons; and again they simply say: "Did we not tell thee that he is a magician?"[3] We shall presently see that Justin actually refers to certain acts of Pontius Pilate in justification of other assertions regarding the trial of Jesus.[4] In the Clementine Recognitions, moreover, the same charge is made by one of the Scribes, who says that Jesus did not perform his miracles as a prophet, but as a magician.[5] Celsus makes a similar charge,[6] and Lactantius refers to such an opinion as prevalent amongst the Jews at the time of Jesus,[7] which we find confirmed by many passages in Talmudic literature.[8] There was, indeed, a book called *Magia Jesu Christi*, of which Jesus himself, it was pretended, was the author.[9]

In speaking of the trial of Jesus, Justin says: "For also as the prophet saith, reviling him (διασύροντες αὐτὸν), they set him (ἐκάθισαν) upon a judgment seat (ἐπὶ βήματος), and said: 'Judge for us' (Κρῖνον ἡμῖν)."[10]—a peculiarity which is not found in the canonical Gospels. Justin had just quoted the words of Isaiah (lxv. 2, lviii. 2): ".....They now ask of me judgment, and dare to draw nigh to God"; and then he cites Psalm xxii. 16, 22: "They pierced my hands and my feet, and upon my vesture they cast lots." He says that this did not happen to David, but was fulfilled in Christ, and the expression regarding the piercing the hands and feet referred to the nails of the cross which were driven through his hands and feet. And after he was crucified they cast lots upon his vesture. "And that these things occurred," he continues, "you may learn from the Acts drawn up under Pontius Pilate."[11]

[1] Καὶ γὰρ μάγον εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐτόλμων λέγειν καὶ λαοπλάνον. *Dial.* 69.

[2] λέγουσιν αὐτῷ γόης ἐστίν, κ.τ.λ. *Evang. Nicod. sive Gesta Pilati, Pars.* I. A. i.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 208; cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i.; *Nicod. Evang. Lat.*, i., p. 239, xxvii., p. 296, cf. 417.

[3] Μὴ οὐκ εἴπαμέν σοι ὅτι γόης ἐστίν; κ.τ.λ. c. ii.; Tischendorf, *Ev. Ap.*, p. 214; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 243. [4] *Apol.*, i. 35, 48.

[5] *Et ecce quidam de Scribis de medio populi exclamans ait: Jesus veste signa et prodigia quæ fecit, ut magus non ut propheta fecit.*, i. 58; cf. 40.

[6] Origen, *Contra Cels.*, ii. 50, 51. [7] *Instit. Div.*, v. 3, *et passim.*

[8] Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*, Works, xi., p. 195 ff.

[9] Cf. August. *de Consensu Evang.*, i. 9; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 305 ff.

[10] Καὶ γὰρ, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ προφήτης, διασύροντες αὐτὸν, ἐκάθισαν ἐπὶ βήματος, καὶ εἶπον· Κρῖνον ἡμῖν. *Apol.*, i. 35.

[11] Καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι γέγονε, δύνασθε μαθεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων ἄκτων. *Apol.*, i. 35.

He likewise upon another occasion refers to the same *Acta* for confirmation of statements.[1] The Gospel of Nicodemus or *Gesta Pilati*, now extant, does not contain the circumstance to which we are referring, but, in contradiction to the statement in the fourth Gospel (xviii. 28, 29), the Jews in this apocryphal work freely go in to the very judgment seat of Pilate.[2] Tischendorf maintains that the first part of the Gospel of Nicodemus, or *Acta Pilati*, still extant, is the work, with more or less of interpolation, which, existing in the second century, is referred to by Justin.[3] A few reasons may here be given against such a conclusion. The fact of Jesus being set upon the judgment seat is not contained in the extant *Acta Pilati* at all, and therefore this work does not correspond with Justin's statement. It seems most unreasonable to suppose that Justin should seriously refer Roman Emperors to a work of this description, so manifestly composed by a Christian, and the *Acta* to which he directs them must have been a presumed official document, to which they had access, as, of course, no other evidence could be of any weight with them. The extant work neither pretends to be, nor has in the slightest degree the form of, an official report. Moreover, the prologue attached to it distinctly states that Ananias, a provincial warden in the reign of Flavius Theodosius (towards the middle of the fifth century), found these Acts written in Hebrew by Nicodemus, and that he translated them into Greek.[4] The work itself, therefore, only pretends to be a private composition in Hebrew, and does not claim any relation to Pontius Pilate. The Greek is very corrupt and degraded, and considerations of style alone would assign it to the fifth century, as would still more imperatively the anachronisms with which it abounds. Tischendorf considers that Tertullian refers to the same work as Justin; but it is evident that he implies an official report, for he says distinctly, after narrating the circumstances of the crucifixion and resurrection: "All these facts regarding Christ, Pilate.....reported to the reigning Emperor Tiberius."[5] It is extremely probable that in saying this Tertullian merely extended the statement of Justin. He nowhere states that he himself had seen this report, nor does Justin, and, as is the case with the latter, some of the facts which Tertullian supposes to be reported by Pilate are not contained in the apocryphal work. There are still extant some apocryphal writings in

[1] *Apol.*, i. 48. Cf. Tertullian, *Apol.* xxi.

[2] *Evang. Nicod. sive Gesta Pilati*, Pars i. A., i. ii.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 208 ff.

[3] *Evang. Apocr. Proleg.*, p. lxiv. ff.; *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, pp. 82–89.

[4] *Evang. Nicod. Proleg.*; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 203 f.

[5] *Ea omnia super Christo Pilatus.....Cæsari tum Tiberio nuntiavit. Apol.* xxi.

the form of official reports made by Pilate of the trial, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus,[1] but none are of very ancient date. It is certain that, on the supposition that Pilate may have made an official report of events so important in their estimation, Christian writers, with greater zeal than conscience, composed fictitious reports in his name, in the supposed interest of their religion; and there was in that day little or no critical sense to detect and discredit such forgeries. There is absolutely no evidence to show that Justin was acquainted with any official report of Pilate to the Roman Emperor, nor, indeed, is it easy to understand how he could possibly have been, even if such a document existed; and it is most probable, as Scholten conjectures, that Justin merely referred to documents which tradition supposed to have been written, but of which he himself had no personal knowledge.[2] Be this as it may, as he considered the incident of the judgment seat a fulfilment of prophecy, there can be little or no doubt that it was narrated in the Memoirs which contained "everything relating to Jesus Christ," and, finding it there, he all the more naturally assumed that it must have been mentioned in some official report.

In the Akhmîm fragment of the Gospel of Peter, published in 1893, we have a similar passage to that quoted by Justin. The fragment states: "They said: 'Let us drag along (*σύρωμεν*) the son of God'.....and they sat him (*ἐκάθισαν αὐτον*) upon a seat of judgment (*καθέδραν κρίσεως*), saying: 'Judge justly (*Δικαίως κρῖνε*), King of Israel.'" This is not in our Gospels, but it has singular points of agreement with the passage in Justin. The Septuagint version of Isaiah, which Justin had previously cited, reads: "They ask me for just judgment" (*αἰτοῦσίν με νῦν κρίσιν δικαίαν*), and doubtless the narrative, like that of all the Gospels regarding the trial and crucifixion of Jesus, was compiled to show the fulfilment of supposed prophecies like this.

We may here go on to quote more fully Justin's allusions to the parting of the garments, which are also in close agreement with the fragment of the Gospel of Peter. Justin says: "And those who were crucifying him parted his garments (*ἐμερίσαν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ*) amongst themselves, casting lots (*λαχμὸν βάλλοντες*), each taking what pleased him, according to the cast of the lot" (*τοῦ κλήρου*).[3] This account, which differs materially from that of our Gospels, may be compared with the words in the fragment. "And they laid the clothes (*τὰ ἐνδύματα*) before him, and distributed them (*διεμερίσαντο*), and cast lots (*λαχμὸν ἔβαλον*) for

[1] Cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 298 ff.; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 796 ff.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 411.

[2] Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 165 ff.

[3] *Dial.* xcvii.

them." The use of the peculiar expression, "λαχμὸν βάλλειν," both in the fragment and by Justin, is most striking, for its employment in this connection is limited, so far as we know, to the Gospel of Peter, Justin, and Cyril.[1] Justin, here, is not making an exact quotation, but merely giving an account of what he believes to have occurred, yet the peculiar words of his text remained in his mind and confirm the idea that it was the Gospel of Peter.

In narrating the agony in the Garden, there are further variations. Justin says: "And the passage, 'All my bones are poured out and dispersed like water; my heart has become like wax melting in the midst of my belly,' was a prediction of that which occurred to him that night when they came out against him to the Mount of Olives to seize him. For in the Memoirs, composed, I say, by his Apostles and their followers, it is recorded that his sweat fell down like drops while he prayed, saying: 'If possible, let this cup pass.'"[2] It will be observed that this is a direct quotation from the Memoirs, but there is a material difference from our Gospels. Luke is the only Gospel which mentions the bloody sweat, and there the account reads (xxii. 44), "as it were drops of blood falling down to the ground."

LUKE. ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.
JUSTIN. ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι κατεχεῖτο.

In addition to the other linguistic differences Justin omits the emphatic αἵματος, which gives the whole point to Luke's account, and which evidently could not have been in the text of the Memoirs. Semisch argues that θρόμβοι alone, especially in medical phraseology, meant "drops of blood," without the addition of αἵματος;[3] but the author of the third Gospel did not think so, and undeniably makes use of both, and Justin does not. Moreover, Luke introduces the expression θρόμβοι αἵματος to show the intensity of the agony, whereas Justin evidently did not mean to express "drops of blood" at all, his intention in referring to the sweat being to show that the prophecy, "All my bones are poured out, etc., like water," had been fulfilled, with which the reading in his Memoirs more closely corresponded. The prayer also so directly quoted decidedly varies from Luke xxii. 42, which reads: "Father, if thou be willing to remove this cup from me":

LUKE. Πάτερ, εἰ βούλει παρενεγκεῖν τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ·
JUSTIN. Παρελθέτω, εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο.

In Matt. xxvi. 39 this part of the prayer is more like the reading

[1] This is also pointed out by Dr. Swete, *The Akhmîm Fragment*, 1893, p. xxxiv. Mr. Rendel Harris says: "I regard it as certain that the reading λαχμὸς implies connection between Justin and Peter, either directly or through a third source accessible to both" (*Contemp. Rev.*, August, 1893, p. 231).

[2] *Dial.* 103. [3] *D. ap. Denkw. Just.*, p. 146.

of Justin: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me" (Πάτερ, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν, παρελθατω ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο·); but that Gospel has nothing of the sweat of agony, which excludes it from consideration. In another place Justin also quotes the prayer in the Garden as follows: "He prayed, saying: 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me'; and besides this, praying, he said: 'Not as I wish, but as thou willest.'" The first phrase,[1] apart from some transposition of words, agrees with Matthew; but even if this reading be preferred, the absence of the incident of the sweat of agony from the first Gospel renders it impossible to regard it as the source; and, further, the second part of the prayer which is here given differs materially both from the first and third Gospels.

MATT.	Nevertheless not as I will but as thou.
LUKE.	Nevertheless not my will but thine be done.
JUSTIN.	Not as I wish but as thou willest.
MATT.	πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ' ὡς σύ.
LUKE.	πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημα μοὺ ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω.
JUSTIN.	μὴ ὡς ἐγὼ βούλομαι, ἀλλ' ὡς σὺ θέλεις.

The two parts of this prayer, moreover, seem to have been separate in the Memoirs, for not only does Justin not quote the latter portion at all in *Dial.* 103, but here he markedly divides it from the former. Justin knows nothing of the episode of the Angel who strengthens Jesus, which is related in Luke xxii. 43. There is, however, a still more important point to mention—that although verses 43, 44, with the incidents of the angel and the bloody sweat, are certainly in a great number of MSS., they are omitted by some of the oldest codices, as, for instance, by the Alexandrian and Vatican MSS.[2] It is evident that in this part Justin's Memoirs differed from our first and third Gospels much in the same way that they do from each other.

In the same chapter Justin states that, when the Jews went out to the Mount of Olives to take Jesus, "there was not even a single man to run to his help as a guiltless person."[3] This is in direct contradiction to all the Gospels,[4] and Justin not only completely ignores the episode of the ear of Malchus, but in this passage excludes it, and his Gospel could not have contained it. Luke is specially marked in generalising the resistance of those

[1] *Dial.* 99.

[2] In the *Sinaitic Codex* they are marked for omission by a later hand. Lachmann brackets, and Drs. Westcott and Hort double-bracket them. The MS. evidence may be found in detail in Scrivener's *Int. to Crit. N. T.*, 2nd ed., p. 521, stated in the way which is most favourable for the authenticity.

[3] Οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὐδὲ μέχρις ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου βοηθεῖν αὐτῷ ὡς ἀναμαρτήτῳ βοηθὸς ὑπῆρχε. *Dial.* 103.

[4] Matt. xxvi. 51 ff.; Mark xiv. 46 ff.; Luke xxii. 49 ff.; John xviii., 10 f.

about Jesus to his capture: "When they which were about him saw what would follow, they said unto him: 'Lord, shall we smite with the sword?' And a certain one of them smote the servant of the high priest and cut off his right ear."[1] As this episode follows immediately after the incident of the bloody sweat and prayer in the Garden, and the statement of Justin occurs in the very same chapter in which he refers to them, this contradiction further tends to confirm the conclusion that Justin employed a different Gospel.

It is quite in harmony with the same peculiar account that Justin states that, "after he (Jesus) was crucified, all his friends (the Apostles) stood aloof from him, having denied him[2]..... (who, after he rose from the dead, and after they were convinced by himself that before his passion he had told them that he must suffer these things, and that they were foretold by the prophets, repented of their flight from him when he was crucified), and while remaining among them he sang praises to God, as is made evident in the *Memoirs of the Apostles*."[3] Justin, therefore, repeatedly asserts that *after* the crucifixion all the Apostles forsook him, and he extends the denial of Peter to the whole of the twelve. It is impossible to consider this distinct and reiterated affirmation a mere extension of the passage, "they all forsook him and fled" (*πάντες ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἔφυγον*),[4] when Jesus was arrested, which proceeded mainly from momentary fear. Justin seems to indicate that the disciples withdrew from and denied Jesus when they saw him crucified, from doubts which consequently arose as to his Messianic character. Now, on the contrary, the canonical Gospels represent the disciples as being together after the crucifixion.[5] Justin does not exhibit any knowledge of the explanation given by the angels at the sepulchre as to Christ having foretold all that had happened,[6] but makes this proceed from Jesus himself. Indeed, he makes no mention of these angels at all.

There are some traces elsewhere of the view that the disciples were offended after the Crucifixion.[7] Hilgenfeld points out the

[1] Luke xxii. 49, 50.

[2] *Μετὰ οὖν τὸ σταυρωθῆναι αὐτὸν, καὶ οἱ γνώριμοι αὐτοῦ πάντες ἀπέστησαν, ἀρνησάμενοι αὐτόν. Apol.*, i. 50.

[3] (*οἵτινες μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. καὶ πεισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτι καὶ πρὸ τοῦ παθεῖν ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ταῦτα αὐτὸν δεῖ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν προφητῶν ὅτι προεκεκήρυκτο ταῦτα, μετενόησον ἐπὶ τῷ ἀφίστασθαι αὐτοῦ ὅτε ἐσταυρώθη*), *καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν διάγων, ὑμνησε τὸν Θεόν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων δηλοῦται γεγενημένον, κ.τ.λ. Dial.* 106; cf. *Apol.* i. 50; *Dial.* 53; *de Resurr.*, 9.

[4] Matt. xxvi. 56; Mark xiv. 50.

[5] Luke xxiv. 9–12, 33; Mark xvi. 10; John xx. 18, 19; cf. Luke xxiii. 49.

[6] Luke xxiv. 4–8; Matt. xxviii. 5–7; Mark xvi. 5–7.

[7] In the *Ascensio Isaiæ*, iii. 14, the following passage occurs: "*Et duodecim, qui cum eo, offensionem accipient in eum, et custodes constituentur, qui custodient sepulchrum.*" Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 246, anm. 2.

appearance of special Petrine tendency in this passage, in the fact that it is not Peter alone, but all the Apostles, who are said to deny their master; and he suggests that an indication of the source from which Justin quoted may be obtained from the kindred quotation in the Epistle to the Smyrnæans (iii.) by pseudo-Ignatius: "For I know that also after his resurrection he was in the flesh, and I believe that he is so now. And when he came to those that were with Peter he said to them: Lay hold, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit. And immediately they touched him and believed, being convinced by his flesh and spirit." Jerome, it will be remembered, found this in the Gospel according to the Hebrews used by the Nazarenes, which he translated,[1] from which we have seen that Justin in all probability derived other particulars differing from the canonical Gospels, and with which we shall constantly meet, in a similar way, in examining Justin's quotations. Origen also found it in a work called the "Teaching of Peter" (Διδαχὴ Πέτρου),[2] which must have been akin to the "Preaching of Peter" (Κήρυγμα Πέτρου).[3] Hilgenfeld suggests that, in the absence of more certain information, there is no more probable source from which Justin may have derived his statement than the Gospel according to Peter, or the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which is known to have contained so much in the same spirit.[4]

It may well be expected that, at least in touching such serious matters as the Crucifixion and last words of Jesus, Justin must adhere with care to authentic records, and not fall into the faults of loose quotation from memory, free handling of texts, and careless omissions and additions, by which those who maintain the identity of the Memoirs with the canonical Gospels seek to explain the systematic variations of Justin's quotations from the text of the latter. It will, however, be found that here also marked discrepancies occur. Justin says, after referring to numerous prophecies regarding the treatment of Christ: "And again, when he says: 'They spake with their lips, they wagged the head, saying: Let him deliver himself.' That all these things happened to the Christ from the Jews, you can ascertain. For when he was being crucified they shot out the lips and wagged their heads, saying: 'Let him who raised the dead deliver himself.'"[5] And in another place, referring to the same Psalm (xxii.) as a prediction of what was to happen to Jesus, Justin says: "For they who saw him crucified

[1] *De Vir. Ill.*, 16. [2] *De Princip., proem.* [3] Grabe, *Spicil. Patr.*, i., p. 56.
[4] Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 248 ff.
[5] Καὶ πάλιν ὅταν λέγῃ· Ἐλάλησαν ἐν χείλεσιν, ἐκίνησαν κεφαλὴν, λέγοντες· Ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτόν. Ἄτινα πάντα ὡς γέγονεν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῷ Χριστῷ, μαθεῖν δύνασθε. Σταυρωθέντος γὰρ αὐτοῦ, ἐξέστρεφον τὰ χείλη, καὶ ἐκίνουν τὰς κεφαλὰς, λέγοντες· Ὁ νεκροὺς ἀνεγείρας ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτόν. *Apol.*, i. 38.

also wagged their heads, each one of them, and distorted (*διέστρεφον*) their lips, and sneeringly and in scornful irony repeated among themselves those words which are also written in the Memoirs of his Apostles: He declared himself the Son of God; (let him) come down, let him walk about; let God save him."[1] In both of these passages Justin directly appeals to written authority. The *μαθεῖν δύνασθε* may leave the source of the first uncertain,[2] but the second is distinctly stated to contain the actual words "written in the Memoirs of his Apostles," and it seems reasonable to suppose that the former passage is also derived from them. It is scarcely necessary to add that both differ very materially from the canonical Gospels.[3] The taunt contained in the first of these passages is altogether peculiar to Justin: "Let him who raised the dead deliver himself" (*Ὁ νεκροὺς ἀνεγείρας ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτόν*);[4] and even if Justin did not indicate a written source, it would not be reasonable to suppose that he should himself for the first time record words to which he refers as the fulfilment of prophecy.[5] It would be still more ineffectual to endeavour to remove the difficulty presented by such a variation by attributing the words to tradition, at the same time that it is asserted that Justin's Memoirs were actually identical with the Gospels. No aberration of memory could account for such a variation, and it is impossible that Justin should prefer tradition regarding a form of words, so liable to error and alteration, with written Gospels within his reach. Besides, to argue that Justin affirmed that the truth of his statement could be ascertained (*μαθεῖν δύνασθε*), whilst the words which he states to have been spoken were not actually recorded, would be against all reason.

[1] *Οἱ γὰρ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν ἐσταυρωμένον καὶ κεφαλὰς ἕκαστος ἐκίνουν, καὶ τὰ χείλη διέστρεφον, καὶ τοῖς μυξωτῆρσιν ἐν ἀλλήλοις διερινοῦντες ἔλεγον εἰρωνευόμενοι ταῦτα ἃ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ γέγραπται· "Υἱὸν Θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἔλεγε· καταβὰς περιπατείτω· σωσάτω αὐτον ὁ Θεός."* *Dial.* 101.

[2] Some writers consider that this is a reference to the *Acta Pilati* as in *Apol.*, i. 35.

[3] Dr. Westcott admits that in the latter passage Justin does profess to give the exact words which were recorded in the Memoirs, and that they are not to be found in our Gospels; "but," he apologetically adds, "we do find these others so closely connected with them that few readers would feel the difference"! This is a specimen of apologetic criticism. Dr. Westcott goes on to say that as no MS. or Father known to him has preserved any reading more closely resembling Justin's, "if it appear not to be deducible from our Gospels, due allowance being made for the object which he had in view, its source must remain concealed" (*On the Canon*, p. 114 f.). Cf. Matt. xxvii. 39–43; Mark xv. 29–32; Luke xxiii. 34–37.

[4] The nearest parallel in our Gospels is in Luke xxiii. 35: "He saved others; let him save himself if this man be the Christ of God, his chosen" (*Ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, σωσάτω ἑαυτόν, κ.τ.λ.*).

[5] Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 244 f.

The second of the mocking speeches[1] of the lookers-on is referred distinctly to the *Memoirs of the Apostles*; but is also, with the accompanying description, foreign to our Gospels. The nearest approach to it occurs in our first Gospel, and we subjoin both passages for comparison :—

JUSTIN, DIAL. 101.	MATT. XXVII. 40, AND 42, 43.
	40. Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself; if thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross.
He declared himself the Son of God; (let him) come down, let him walk about; let God save him.	42. He saved others, himself he cannot save. He is the King of Israel; let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe in him.
	43. He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him, for he said, I am the Son of God.
γιὸν θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἔλεγε· καταβὰς περιπατείτω· σωσάτω αὐτὸν ὁ θεός.	42. *.....καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ πιστεύσομεν ἐπ' αὐτῷ.* 43. *πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ῥυσάσθω νῦν αὐτὸν*[2] *εἰ θέλει αὐτόν· εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός.*

It is evident that Justin's version is quite distinct from this, and cannot have been taken from our Gospels, although professedly derived from the *Memoirs of the Apostles*.

Justin likewise mentions the cry of Jesus on the cross, "O God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Ὁ *θεός, ὁ θεός μου, ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;*),[3] as a fulfilment of the words of the Psalm, which he quotes here, and elsewhere,[4] with the peculiar addition of the Septuagint version : "attend to me" (*πρόσχες μοι*), which, however, he omits when giving the cry of Jesus, thereby showing that he follows a written source which did not contain it, for the quotation of the Psalm, and of the cry which is cited to show that it refers to Christ, immediately follow each other. He apparently knows nothing of the Chaldaic cry, "Eli, Eli, lama sabacthani," of the Gospels.[5] The first and second Gospels give the words of the cry from the Chaldaic differently from Justin, from the version of the LXX., and from each other. Matt. xxvii. 46, Θεέ *μου, θεέ μου, ἵνα τί με ἐγκατέλιπες*; Mark xv. 34, Ὁ

[1] Semisch argues that both forms are quotations of the same sentence, and that there is consequently a contradiction in the very quotations themselves; but there can be no doubt that the two phrases are distinct parts of the mockery, and the very same separation and variation occur in each of the canonical Gospels. *Die ap. Denkw. Mart. Just.*, p. 282; cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 244.

[2] *The Cod. Sin.* omits *αὐτὸν*.

[3] *Dial.* 99.

[4] *Dial.* 98.

[5] Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34.

θεὸς, ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με; the third Gospel makes no mention at all of this cry, but, instead, has one altogether foreign to the other Gospels: "And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and said: Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said this, he expired."[1] Justin has this cry also, and in the same form as the third Gospel. He says: "For when he (Jesus) was giving up his spirit on the cross, he said: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,' as I have also learned from the Memoirs."[2] Justin's Gospel, therefore, contained both cries, and as even the first two Synoptics mention a second cry of Jesus[3] without, however, giving the words, it is not surprising that other Gospels should have existed which included both. Even if we had no trace of this cry in any other ancient work, there would be no ground for asserting that Justin must have derived it from the third Gospel, for, if there be any historical truth in the statement that these words were actually spoken by Jesus, it follows, of course, that they may have been, and probably were, reported in a dozen Christian writings now no longer extant, and in all probability they existed in some of the many works referred to in the prologue to the third Gospel. Both cries, however, are given in the Gospel of Nicodemus, or *Gesta Pilati*, to which reference has already so frequently been made. In the Greek versions edited by Tischendorf we find only the form contained in Luke. In the Codex A the passage reads: "And crying with a loud voice, Jesus said: Father, *Baddach ephkid rouchi* –that is, interpreted: 'into thy hands I commend my spirit': and, having said this, he gave up the ghost."[4] In the Codex B the text is: "Then Jesus, having called out with a loud voice, 'Father, into thy hands will I commend my spirit,' expired."[5] In the ancient Latin version, however, both cries are given: "And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, *Hely, Hely, lama zabacthani*, which, interpreted, is: 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' And after this Jesus said: 'Father, into thy

[1] Καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν. Luke xxiii. 46.

[2] Καὶ γὰρ ἀποδιδοὺς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τῷ σταυρῷ, εἶπε, Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου· ὡς καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων καὶ τοῦτο ἐμαθον. *Dial.* 105.

[3] Matt. xxvii. 50; Mark xv. 37.

[4] Καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Πατήρ, βαδδὰχ ἐφκὶδ ῥουέλ, ὁ ἑρμηνεύεται Εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθημι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα. *Evang. Nicod.*, Pars I. A. *sive Gesta Pilati*, xi.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 233; cf. Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 590 f.

[5] Ἔπειτα ὁ Ἰησοῦς κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παραθήσομαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου, ἀπέπνευσε. *Ev. Nicod.*, Pars I. B. *sive Acta Pilati* B., xi.; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 287.

hands I commend my spirit'; and, saying this, he gave up the ghost."[1]

One of the Codices of the same apocryphal work likewise gives the taunting speeches of the Jews in a form more nearly approaching that of Justin's Memoirs than any found in our Gospels. "And the Jews that stood and looked ridiculed him, and said: If thou saidst truly that thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross, and at once, that we may believe in thee. Others, ridiculing, said: He saved others, he healed others, and restored the sick, the paralytic, lepers, demoniacs, the blind, the lame, the dead, and himself he cannot heal."[2] The fact that Justin actually refers to certain Acta Pilati in connection with the Crucifixion renders this coincidence all the more important. Other texts of this Gospel read: "And the Chief Priests, and the rulers with them, derided him, saying: He saved others, let him save himself; if he is the Son of God, let him come down from the cross."[3]

It is clear from the whole of Justin's treatment of the narrative that he followed a Gospel adhering more closely than the canonical to Psalm xxii., but yet with peculiar variations from it. Our Gospels differ very much from each other; Justin's Memoirs of the Apostles in like manner differed from them. It had its characteristic features clearly and sharply defined. In this way his systematic variations are natural and perfectly intelligible, but they become quite inexplicable if it be supposed that, having our Gospels for his source, he thus persistently and in so arbitrary a way ignored, modified, or contradicted their statements.

Upon two occasions Justin distinctly states that the Jews sent persons throughout the world to spread calumnies against Christians.

[1] *Et circa horam nonam exclamavit Jesus voce magnâ dicens: Hely, Hely, lama zabacthani, quod est interpretatum: Deus meus, Deus meus, ut quid dereliquisti me? Et post hæc dicit Jesus: Pater in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum. Et hæc dicens emisit spiritum." Nicod. Ev.*, xi.; Fabricius, *Cod. Ap. N. T.*, i., p. 261; cf. Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 591 f.

[2] Οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ ἱστάμενοι καὶ βλέποντες κατεγέλων αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον Ἐὰν ἀληθῶς ἔλεγες ὅτι υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, κατάβηθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, καὶ παρευθὺς ἵνα πιστεύσωμεν εἰς σέ. Ἕτεροι ἔλεγον καταγελῶντες Ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἄλλους ἐθεράπευσεν, καὶ ἰάσατο ἀσθενεῖς, παραλελυμένους, λεπρούς, δαιμονιζομένους, τυφλούς, χωλούς, νενεκρωμένους, καὶ ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται θεραπεῦσαι. *Evang. Nicod.*, Pars I. B., sive Acta Pilati, B. X.; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 286.

[3] *Ev. Nicod.*, Pars I. A. x.; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 232; cf. Thilo., *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 584; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 259; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 340. There are differences between all these texts—indeed, there are scarcely two MSS. which agree—clearly indicating that we have now nothing but corrupt versions of a more ancient text.

"When you knew that he had risen from the dead, and ascended into heaven, as the prophets had foretold, not only did you (the Jews) not repent of the wickedness which you had committed, but at that time you selected and sent forth from Jerusalem throughout the land chosen men, saying that the atheistic heresy of the Christians had arisen," etc.[1]....."from a certain Jesus, a Galilæan impostor, whom we crucified, but his disciples stole him by night from the tomb where he had been laid when he was unloosed from the cross, and they now deceive men, saying that he has risen from the dead and ascended into heaven."[2] This circumstance is not mentioned by our Gospels, but, reiterated twice by Justin in almost the same words, it was in all probability contained in the Memoirs. Eusebius quotes the passage from Justin without comment, evidently on account of the information which it conveyed. The fragment of the Gospel of Peter describes the elders as going to Pilate and asking for soldiers to watch the grave for three days, "lest his disciples steal him, and the people believe that he rose from the dead."

These instances, which, although far from complete, have already occupied too much of our space, show that Justin quotes from the *Memoirs of the Apostles* many statements and facts of Gospel history which are not only foreign to our Gospels, but in some cases contradictory to them, whilst the narrative of the most solemn events in the life of Jesus presents distinct and systematic variations from parallel passages in the Synoptic records. It will now be necessary to compare his general quotations from the same Memoirs with the Canonical Gospels, and here a very wide field opens before us. As we have already stated, Justin's works teem with these quotations, and to take them all in detail would be impossible within the limits of this work. Such a course, moreover, is unnecessary. It may be broadly stated that even those who maintain the use of the Canonical Gospels can only point out two or three passages out of this vast array which verbally agree with them.[3] This extraordinary anomaly—on the supposition that Justin's Memoirs were in fact our Gospels—is, as we have mentioned, explained by the convenient hypothesis that Justin quotes imperfectly from memory, interweaves and

[1] *Dial.* 17.

[2] *Ib.*, 108. This passage commences with statements to the same effect as the preceding.

[3] Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 229; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 252 ff., p. 255; Kirchhofer, *Quellensamml.*, p. 34 f., p. 89; Reuss, *Hist. du Canon*, p. 56; Schwegler, *Das Nachap. Zeit.*, i., p. 222 f.; Semisch, *Die ap. Denkw. M. Just.*, p. 140 f.; De Wette, *Lehrb. Einl. N. T.*, p. 104 f.; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 106 f.

modifies texts, and, in short, freely manipulates these Gospels according to his argument. Even strained to the uttermost, however, could this be accepted as a reasonable explanation of such systematic variation, that only twice or thrice out of the vast number of his quotations does he literally agree with passages in them? In order to illustrate the case with absolute impartiality we shall first take the instances brought forward as showing agreement with our Synoptic Gospels.

Tischendorf only cites two passages in support of his affirmation that Justin makes use of our first Gospel.[1] It might be supposed that, in selecting these, at least two might have been produced literally agreeing; but this is not the case, and this may be taken as an illustration of the almost universal variation of Justin's quotations. The first of Tischendorf's examples is the supposed use of Matt. viii. 11, 12: "Many shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down," etc. (Πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἥξουσιν, κ.τ.λ.) Now this passage is repeated by Justin no less than three times in three very distinct parts of his *Dialogue with Trypho*,[2] with a uniform variation from the text of Matthew—"*They* shall come from the *west* and from the east," etc. (Ἥξουσιν ἀπὸ δυσμῶν καί ἀνατολῶν, κ.τ.λ.)[3] That a historical saying of Jesus should be reproduced in many Gospels, and that no particular work can have any prescriptive right to it, must be admitted, so that even if the passage in Justin agreed literally with our first Synoptic, it would not afford any proof of the actual use of that Gospel; but when, on the contrary, Justin upon three several occasions, and at distinct intervals of time, repeats the passage with the same persistent variation from the reading in Matthew, not only can it not be ascribed to that Gospel, but there is reason to conclude that Justin derived it from another source. It may be added that πολλοί is anything but a word uncommon in his vocabulary, and that elsewhere, for instance, he twice quotes a passage similar to one in Matthew, in which, amongst other variations, he reads "*Many* shall come (πολλοὶ ἥξουσιν)," instead of the phrase found in that Gospel.[4]

The second example adduced by Tischendorf is the supposed quotation of Matt. xii. 39; but in order fully to comprehend the nature of the affirmation, we quote the context of the Gospel and of Justin in parallel columns—

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 27, anm. 2.

[2] *Dial.* 76, 120, 140.

[3] In *Dial.* 76 the text reads "from the east and from the west."

[4] *Apol.*, i. 16, *Dial.* 35; cf. Matt. vii. 15.

Justin. Dial. 107.	Matthew xii. 38, 39.
And that he should rise again on the third day after the crucifixion, it is written in the Memoirs that some of your neighbours questioning him said: "Show us a sign;" and he answered them: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to them (*αὐτοῖς*) but the sign of Jonah ('Ιωνᾶ)."	38. Then certain of the scribes and Pharisees answered him, saying: Master, we would see a sign from thee. 39. But he answered and said unto them: An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it (*αὐτῇ*), but the sign of the prophet Jonah ('Ιωνᾶ *τοῦ προφήτου*).
Καὶ ὅτι τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἔμελλεν ἀναστήσεσθαι μετὰ τὸ σταυρωθῆναι, γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ὅτι οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ὑμῶν συζητοῦντες αὐτῷ ἔλεγον, ὅτι, "Δεῖξον ἡμῖν σημεῖον." καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς, Γενεὰ πονηρὰ, κ.τ.λ.	*Τότε ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων λέγοντες, "Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἀπο σοῦ σημεῖον ἰδεῖν." ὁ δέ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Γενεὰ πονηρὰ, κ.τ.λ.*

Now it is clear that Justin here directly professes to quote from the Memoirs, and consequently that accuracy may be expected; but passing over the preliminary substitution of "some of your nation" for "certain of the scribes and Pharisees," although it recalls the "some of them," and "others," by which the parallel passage, otherwise so different, is introduced in Luke xi. 15, 16, 29 ff.,[1] the question of the Jews, which should be literal, is quite different from that of the first Gospel, whilst there are variations in the reply of Jesus, which, if not so important, are still undeniable. We cannot compare with the first Gospel the parallel passages in the second and third Gospels without recognising that other works may have narrated the same episode with similar variations, and whilst the distinct differences which exist totally exclude the affirmation that Justin quotes from Matthew, everything points to the conclusion that he makes use of another source. This is confirmed by another important circumstance. After enlarging during the remainder of the chapter upon the example of the people of Nineveh, Justin commences the next by returning to the answer of Jesus, and making the following statement: "And though all of your nation were acquainted with these things which occurred to Jonah, and Christ proclaimed among you that he would give you the sign of Jonah, exhorting you, at least, after his resurrection from the dead to repent of your evil deeds, and like the Ninevites to supplicate God, that your nation and city might not be captured and destroyed as it has been destroyed; yet not only have you not repented on learning his resurrection from the dead, but, as I have already said,[2] you sent chosen[3] and select

[1] Cf. Mark viii. 11.

[2] *Dial.* 17. The passage quoted above, p. 215 f.

[3] *χειροτονήσαντες.* Literally, "elected by a show of hands"—by vote.

men throughout all the world, proclaiming that an atheistic and impious heresy had arisen from a certain Jesus, a Galilæan impostor," etc.[1] Now, not only do our Gospels not mention this mission, as we have already pointed out, but they do not contain the exhortation to repent, at least, after the resurrection of Jesus here referred to, and which evidently must have formed part of the episode in the Memoirs.

Tischendorf does not produce any other instances of supposed quotations of Justin from Matthew, but rests his case upon these. As they are the best examples, apparently, which he can point out, we may judge of the weakness of his argument. De Wette divides the quotations of Justin, which may be compared with our first and third Gospels, into several categories. Regarding the first class, he says: "Some agree quite literally, which, however, is seldom";[2] and under this head he can only collect three passages of Matthew, and refer to one of Luke. Of the three from Matthew, the first is that, viii. 11, 12,[3] also brought forward by Tischendorf, of which we have already disposed. The second is Matt. v. 20: "For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." A parallel passage to this exists in *Dial.* 105, a chapter in which there are several quotations not found in our Gospels at all, with the exception that the first words, "For I say unto you that," are not in Justin. We shall speak of this passage presently. De Wette's third passage is Matt. vii. 19: "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire," which, with the exception of one word, "but," at the commencement of the sentence in Justin, also agrees with his quotation.[4] In these two short passages there are no peculiarities specially pointing to the first Gospel as their source, and it cannot be too often repeated that the mere coincidence of short historical sayings in two works by no means warrants the conclusion that the one is dependent on the other. In order, however, to enable the reader to form a correct estimate of the value of the similarity of the two passages above noted, and also, at the same time, to examine a considerable body of evidence, selected with evident impartiality, we propose to take all Justin's readings of the Sermon on the Mount, from which the above passages are taken, and compare them with our Gospels. This should furnish a fair test of the composition of the *Memoirs of the Apostles*.

Taking first, for the sake of continuity, the first Apology, we find that chapters xv., xvi., xvii., are composed almost entirely of

[1] *Dial.* 108. [2] De Wette, *Lehrb. Einl. N.T.*, p. 104.
[3] *Dial.* 76, 120, 140; cf. p. 347. [4] *Apol.*, i. 16.

examples of what Jesus himself taught, introduced by the remark with which chapter xiv. closes, that "Brief and concise sentences were uttered by him, for he was not a sophist, but his word was the power of God."[1] It may broadly be affirmed that, with the exception of the few words quoted above by De Wette, not a single quotation of the words of Jesus in these three chapters agrees with the canonical Gospels. We shall, however, confine ourselves at present to the Sermon on the Mount. We must mention that Justin's text is quite continuous, except where we have inserted asterisks. We subjoin Justin's quotations, together with the parallel passages in our Gospels, side by side, for greater facility of comparison.[2]

JUSTIN.	GOSPEL.
α. Apol., i., 15. He (Jesus) spoke thus of chastity: Whosoever may gaze on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery already in the heart before God.	Matt. v. 28. But I say unto you, that everyone that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.
β. And, if thy right eye offend thee cut it out, for it is profitable for thee to enter into the kingdom of heaven with one eye (rather) than having two to be thrust into the everlasting fire.	29. But if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.
α. Περὶ μὲν οὖν σωφροσύνης τοσοῦτον εἶπεν· Ὃς ἂν ἐμβλέψῃ γυναικὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς ἤδη ἐμοίχευσε τῇ καρδίᾳ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ.	[3]Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων,[4] γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.
β. Καί·[3] Εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔκκοψον αὐτόν· συμφέρει γάρ σοι μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρα-	Εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔξελε[5] αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου, κ.τ.λ.; cf.

[1] Βραχεῖς δὲ καὶ σύντομοι παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι γεγόνασιν. Οὐ γὰρ σοφιστὴς ὑπῆρχεν, ἀλλὰ δύναμις Θεοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἦν. *Apol.*, i. 14. This description completely contradicts the representation in the fourth Gospel of the discourses of Jesus. It seems clearly to indicate that Justin had no knowledge of that Gospel.

[2] It need not be said that the variations between the quotations of Justin and the text of our Gospels must be looked for only in the Greek. For the sake of the reader unacquainted with Greek, however, we shall endeavour as far as possible to indicate in translation where differences exist, although this cannot of course be fully done, nor often without being more literal than is desirable. Where it is not necessary to amend the authorised version of the New Testament for the sake of more closely following the text, and marking differences from Justin, we shall adopt it. We divide the quotations where desirable by initial letters, in order to assist reference at the end of our quotations from the Sermon on the Mount.

[3] The "καί" here forms no part of the quotation, and seems to separate the two passages, which were, therefore, probably distinct in Justin's Memoirs, although consecutive verses in Matthew.

[4] Origen repeatedly uses ὃς ἐὰν ἐμβλέψῃ, and only once πᾶς ὁ βλέπων. Griesbach, *Symb. Criticæ*, 1785, ii., p. 251.

[5] Clem. Al. reads ἔκκοψον like Justin. Griesbach, *ib.*, ii., p. 252.

JUSTIN.	GOSPEL.
νῶν ἢ μετὰ τῶν δύο πεμφθῆναι εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ.	Matt. xviii. 9.[1].....*καλόν σοί ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.*
γ. And, Whoever marrieth a woman divorced from another man committeth adultery.	Matt. v. 32. And whosoever shall marry a woman divorced committeth adultery.
Καί, Ὃς γαμεῖ ἀπολελυμένην ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀνδρός, μοιχᾶται.	.....*καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾶται.*[2]
* * * *	
δ. And regarding our affection for all, he taught thus: If ye love them which love you, what new thing do ye? for even the fornicators do this; but I say unto you: Pray for your enemies and love them which hate you, and bless them which curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you.	Matt. v. 46. For if ye should love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? v. 44.[3] But I say unto you: Love your enemies[4] (bless them which curse you, do good to them which hate you), and pray for them which (despitefully use you and) persecute you.[5]

[1] Matt. v. 29, 30, it will be remembered, are repeated with some variation and also reversed in order, and with a totally different context, Matt. xviii. 8, 9. The latter verse, the Greek of the concluding part of which we give above, approximates more nearly in form to Justin's, but is still widely different. "And if thine eye ('right' omitted) offend thee pluck it out and cast it from thee; it is good for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire." The sequence of Matt. v. 28, 29, points specially to it. The double occurrence of this passage, however, with a different context, and with the order reversed in Matthew, renders it almost certain that the two passages α. and β. were separate in the Memoirs. The reading of Mark ix. 47 is equally distinct from Justin's: And if thine eye offend thee cast it out (*ἔκβαλε αὐτόν*); it is good for thee (*καλόν ἐστίν σε*) to enter into the kingdom of God (*τοῦ θεοῦ*) with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell. (*ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς γέενναν.*)

[2] Cf. Matt. xix. 9, Luke xvi. 18. The words *ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀνδρὸς* are peculiar to Justin. The passage in Luke has *ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς*, but differs in the rest.

[3] It will be observed that here again Justin's Gospel reverses the order in which the parallel passage is found in our Synoptics. It does so indeed with a clearness of design which, even without the actual peculiarities of diction and construction, would indicate a special and different source. The passage varies throughout from our Gospels, but Justin repeats the same phrases in the same order elsewhere. In *Dial.* 133 he says: "While we all pray for you, and for all men as our Christ and Lord taught us to do, enjoining us to pray even for our enemies, and to love them that hate us, and to bless them that curse us" (*εὔχεσθαι καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν, καὶ ἀγαπᾷν τοὺς μισοῦντας, καὶ εὐλογεῖν τοὺς καταρωμένους*). And again in *Apol.*, i. 14, he uses the expression that Christians pray for their enemies (*ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν εὐχόμενοι*) according to the precepts of Christ. The variation is therefore not accidental, but from a different text.

[4] The two passages within brackets are not found in any of the oldest MSS., and are only supported by Codices D, E, and a few obscure texts. All modern critics reject them. They are omitted from the revised version.

[5] The parallel passage in Luke vi. 32, 27, 28, presents similar variations from Matt., though not so great as those of Justin from them both.

JUSTIN.	GOSPEL.
Περὶ δὲ τοῦ στέργειν ἅπαντας, ταῦτα ἐδίδαξεν· Εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε; καὶ γὰρ οἱ πόρνοι τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν. Ἐγὼ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω· Εὔχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς, καὶ εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν, καὶ εὔχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.	v. 46. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι οὕτως ποιοῦσιν; v. 44. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν (εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς,) καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν[3] (ἐπηρεαζόντων καὶ) διωκόντων ὑμᾶς.
ε. And that we should communicate to the needy and do nothing for praise, he said thus :	
Give ye to every one that asketh, and from him that desireth to borrow turn not ye away ; for if ye	Matt. v. 42. Give thou to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.[1]
lend to them from whom ye hope to receive, what new thing do ye? for even the publicans do this.	Cf. Luke vi. 34. And if ye lend to them from whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners lend, etc.
But ye, lay not up for yourselves upon the earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt and robbers break through,	Matt. vi. 19. Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal ;
but lay up for yourselves in the heavens, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt.	vi. 20. But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal.
For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, but destroy his soul? or what shall he give in exchange for it? Lay up, therefore, in the heavens, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt.[2]	Matt. xvi. 26. For what shall a man be profited if he shall gain the whole world, but lose his soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?
Εἰς δὲ τὸ κοινωνεῖν τοῖς δεομένοις, καὶ μηδὲν πρὸς δόξαν ποιεῖν, ταῦτα ἔφη,	
Παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι δίδοτε, καὶ τὸν βουλόμενον δανείσασθαι, μὴ ἀποστραφῆτε·	Matt. v. 42. Τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δός, καὶ τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείσασθαι, μὴ ἀποστραφῇς.
εἰ γὰρ δανείζετε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε; τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ποιοῦσιν.	Cf. Luke vi. 34. Καὶ ἐὰν δανίζετε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς δανίζουσιν, κ.τ.λ.
Ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ θησαυρίζετε ἑαυτοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου σὴς καὶ βρῶσις ἀφανίζει, καὶ λῃσταὶ διορύσσουσι·	Matt. vi. 19. Μὴ θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου σὴς καὶ βρῶσις ἀφανίζει, καὶ ὅπου κλέπται διορύσσουσιν καὶ κλέπτουσιν·

[1] In the first Gospel the subject breaks of at the end of v. 42. v. 46 may be compared with Justin's continuation, but it is fundamentally different. The parallel passages in Luke vi. 30, 34, present still greater variations. We have given vi. 34 above, as nearer Justin than Matt. v. 46. It will be remarked that to find a parallel for Justin's continuation, without break, of the subject, we must jump from Matt. v. 42, 46, to vi. 19, 20. [2] See next page, note 1.

JUSTIN.	GOSPEL.
θησαυρίζετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου οὔτε σὴς οὔτε βρῶσις ἀφανίζει.	vi. 20. *θησαυρίζετε δὲ ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὅπου οὔτε σὴς οὔτε βρῶσις ἀφανίζει, καὶ ὅπου κλέπται οὐ διορύσσουσιν οὐδὲ κλέπτουσιν.*
Τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἂν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν, αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσῃ ; ἢ τί δώσει αὐτῆς ἀντάλλαγμα ;	xvi. 26. *Τί γὰρ ὠφεληθήσεται ἄνθρωπος, ἐὰν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῇ ; ἢ τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ ;*
θησαυρίζετε οὖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου οὔτε σὴς οὔτε βρῶσις ἀφανίζει.[1]	
ζ. And: Be ye kind and merciful as your Father also is kind and merciful, and maketh his sun to rise on sinners, and just and evil.[2]	Luke vi. 36.[3] Be ye merciful even as your Father also is merciful. Matt. v. 45.[4].....for he maketh his sun to rise on evil and good and sendeth rain on just and unjust.
But be not careful what ye shall eat and what ye shall put on.	Matt. vi. 25. Therefore I say unto you, Be not careful for your life what ye shall eat and what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body what ye shall put on.....
Are ye not better than the birds and the beasts? And God feedeth them.	vi. 26. Behold the birds of the air that they sow not, &c., &c., yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?
Therefore be not careful what ye shall eat, or what ye shall put on,	vi. 31.[5] Therefore be not careful, saying: what shall we eat? or what shall we drink, or with what shall we be clothed?
for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things,	vi. 32. For after all these things do the Gentiles seek: for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye need all these things.

[1] This phrase, it will be observed, is also introduced higher up in the passage, and its repetition in such a manner, with the same variations, emphatically demonstrates the unity of the whole quotation.

[2] This passage (ζ) is repeated with the peculiar *χρῆστοὶ καὶ οἰκτ.* twice in *Dial.* 96, and in connection with the same concluding words, which are quite separate in our Synoptics. In that place, however, in paraphrasing and not quoting, he adds, "and sending rain on holy and evil." Critics conjecture with much probability that the words *καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ ὁσίους* have been omitted above after *δικαίους*, by a mistake either of the transcriber or of Justin. In the *Clementine Homilies* (iii. 57) a similar combination to that of Justin's occurs together with a duplication recalling that of Justin, although *ἀγαθοί* is substituted for *χρηστοί*. *Γίνεσθε ἀγαθοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ὃς ἀνατέλλει τὸν ἥλιον ἐπ ἀγαθοῖς, κ.τ.λ.* Epiphanius also twice makes use of a similar combination, although with variations in language; cf. Hær. lxvi. 22, xxxiii. 10. Origen likewise combines Matt. v. 48 and 45; cf. *de Princip.*, ii. 4, § 1. These instances confirm the indication of an ancient connection of the passage as quoted by Justin.

[3] There is no parallel to this in the first Gospel. Matt. v. 48 is too remote in sense as well as language.

[4] The first part of v. 45 is quite different from the context in Justin: "That ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh," etc.

[5] There is a complete break here in the continuity of the parallel passage.

JUSTIN.	GOSPEL.
but seek ye the kingdom of the heavens, and all these things shall be added unto you,	vi. 33. But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.
for where the treasure is there is also the mind of the man.	vi. 21.[1] For where thy treasure is there will thy heart be also.
Καὶ, Γίνεσθε δὲ χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες, ὡς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν χρηστός ἐστι καὶ οἰκτίρμων, καὶ τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ ἁμαρτωλοὺς καὶ δικαίους καὶ πονηρούς.	Luke vi. 36. Γίνεσθε οὖν οἰκτίρμονες, καθὼς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν. Matt. v. 45.....ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους.
Μὴ μεριμνᾶτε δὲ, τί φάγητε, ἢ τί ἐνδύσησθε·	Matt. vi. 25. Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε καὶ τί πίητε,[2] μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν τί ἐνδύσησθε.....
οὐχ ὑμεῖς τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ τῶν θηρίων διαφέρετε ; καὶ ὁ θεὸς τρέφει αὐτά.	vi. 26. Ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, κ.τ.λ. καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τρέφει αὐτά· οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν ;
Μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε τί φάγητε, ἢ τί ἐνδύσησθε.	vi. 31. μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε λέγοντες· Τί φάγωμεν ἢ τί πίωμεν ἢ τί περιβαλώμεθα ;
οἶδε γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος, ὅτι τούτων χρείαν ἔχετε·	vi. 32. πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ ἔθνη ἐπιζητοῦσιν· οἶδεν γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος, ὅτι χρῄζετε τούτων ἁπάντων.
ζητεῖτε δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.	vi. 33. ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.
Ὅπου γὰρ ὁ θησαυρός ἐστιν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ νοῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.	vi. 21. Ὅπου γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θησαυρός σου, ἐκεῖ ἔσται καὶ ἡ καρδία σου.
η. And : Do not these things to be seen of men, otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven.	Matt. vi. 1. But take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men to be seen of them, otherwise ye have no reward from your Father which is in heaven.
καὶ, Μὴ ποιῆτε ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· εἰ δὲ μή γε, μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.	vi. 1. Προσέχετε δὲ τὴν δικαιοσύνην ὑμῶν μὴ ποιεῖν ἔμπροσθεν[3] τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς· εἰ δὲ μήγε, μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν τῷ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.
Apol. i., 16. θ. And regarding our being patient under injuries, and ready to help all,	Matt. v. 39. But I say unto you that ye resist not evil,[4] but whosoever shall smite

[1] Cf. Luke xii. 22–34, which, however, is equally distinct from Justin's text. The difference of order will not have escaped notice.

[2] The *Cod. Sinaiticus* omits καὶ τί πίητε. Codices A, C, and D are defective at the part. *Cod. B* and most other MSS. have the words.

[3] A few MSS. read "alms," ἐλεημοσύνην, here; but the *Cod. Sin. Vat.*, and all the older Codices, have the reading of the text which is adopted by all modern editors.

[4] It is apparent that if Justin could have quoted this phrase it would have suited him perfectly.

JUSTIN.	GOSPEL.
and free from anger, this is what he said: Unto him striking thy cheek offer the other also; and him who carrieth off thy cloak or thy coat do not thou prevent.	thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also. v. 40. And to him who would sue thee at law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.
But whosoever shall be angry is in danger of the fire.	v. 22.[2] But I say unto you that every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment, etc.
But every one who compelleth thee to go a mile, follow twain.	v. 41. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.
And let your good works shine before men so that, perceiving, they may adore your Father which is in heaven.	v. 16. Even so let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven.
* * * *	
Τῷ τύπτοντί σου τὴν σιαγόνα, πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην· καὶ τὸν αἴροντά σου τὸν χιτῶνα, ἢ τὸ ἱμάτιον μὴ κωλύσῃς.	Matt. v. 39.[3] Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ· ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ῥαπίσει ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν σου σιαγόνα, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην· v. 40. καὶ τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι καὶ τὸν χιτῶνά σου λαβεῖν, ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον·
Ὃς δ' ἂν ὀργισθῇ, ἔνοχός ἐστιν εἰς τὸ πῦρ. Παντὶ δὲ ἀγγαρεύοντί σοι μίλιον, ἀκολούθησον δύο. Λαμψάτω δὲ ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα[1] ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἵνα βλέποντες, θαυμάζωσι τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.	v. 22. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ[4] ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει· κ.τ.λ. v. 41. Καὶ ὅστις σε ἀγγαρεύσει μίλιον ἕν, ὕπαγε μετ' αὐτοῦ δύο. v. 16. Οὕτως λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα καὶ δοξάσωσιν τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.
* * * *	
1. And regarding our not swearing at all, but ever speaking the truth, he thus taught:—	Matt. v. 34. But I say unto you, Swear not at

[1] Clement of Alexandria has in one place λαμψ. σου τὰ ἔργα, and again τὰ ἀγαθὰ ὑμῶν ἔργα λαμψάτω. Cf. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.*, ii., p. 250.

[2] That part of Matt. v. 22 intrudes itself between parallels found in v. 40 and 41 will not have been overlooked.

[3] The parallel passage, Luke vi. 29, is closer to Justin's, but still presents distinct variations: "Unto him smiting thee on the cheek offer the other also, and from him that carrieth off thy coat do not thou withhold (μὴ κωλύσῃς) thy cloak also." Τῷ τύπτοντί σε ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα, πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσῃς. The whole context, however, excludes Luke; cf. Mayerhoff, *Einl. petr. Schr.*, p. 272.

[4] εἰκῇ being omitted from *Cod. Sin. Vat.*, and other important MSS., we do not insert it.

JUSTIN.	GOSPEL.
Ye may not swear at all, but let your yea be yea, and your nay nay, for what is more than these (is) of the evil one.	all, neither by heaven, etc. v. 37. But let your speech be yea yea, nay nay, for what is more than these is of the evil one.
Περὶ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ὀμνύναι ὅλως, τάληθῆ δὲ λέγειν ἀεί, οὕτως παρεκελεύσατο· Μὴ ὀμόσητε ὅλως· Ἔστω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναί· καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ.[1] τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ.	Matt. v. 34. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως· μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, κ.τ.λ. v. 37. Ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν ναὶ ναί, οὒ οὔ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν.
* * * * κ. For not those who merely make profession, but those who do the works, as he said, shall be saved. For he spake thus :	
κ 1. Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall, etc.	Matt. vii. 21. Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall, etc.
κ 2. For whosoever heareth me and doeth what I say, heareth him that sent me.	Luke x. 16.[2] He hearing you heareth me, and he despising you, etc., and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.
κ 3. But many will say to me : Lord, Lord, did we not eat and drink in thy name, and do wonders ?	Matt. vii. 22. Many will say to me in that day : Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in thy name ? and in thy name cast out devils ? and in thy name do many wonders ?
κ 4. And then will I say unto them : Depart from me, workers of iniquity.	vii. 23. And then will I confess unto them that : I never knew you : Depart from me, ye that work iniquity.
κ 5. There shall he weeping and gnashing of teeth, when indeed the righteous shall shine as the sun, but	Matt. xiii. 42..... and shall cast them into the furnace of fire : there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth.

[1] This agrees with a passage which occurs twice in the *Clementine Homilies*. The version in Ep. of James v. 12 is evidently a quotation from a source different from Matthew, and supports Justin. Clement Al. twice uses a similar expression, and Epiphanius does so once, though probably following the Ep. of James. The *Apostolic Constitutions* also quotes in similar manner. The context of the *Clementine Homilies* corresponds with that of Justin, but not so the others. We contrast all these passages below :—

James v. 12	ἤτω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναί, καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ.
Clem. Hom., iii. 55	ἔστω ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναί, τὸ οὒ οὔ.
Ib., xix. 2	ἔστω ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναί, καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ.
Justin, *Apol.*, i. 16	ἔστω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναί, καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ.
Clem. Al., *Strom.*, v. 14, § 100	ἔστω ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναί, καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ.
Epiph., *Hær.*, xix. 6	ἤτω ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναί, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὔ.
Constit. Ap., v. 12	εἶναι δὲ τὸ ναὶ ναί, καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ.

[2] Cf. Matt. x. 40, Mark ix. 37, Luke ix. 48, which are still more remote. In Matt. vii. 24 we find : "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them (καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτούς), I will liken him unto," etc. This, however, as the continuation of v. 21 23 quoted above immediately before this passage, is very abrupt, but it seems to indicate the existence of such a passage as we find in Justin's Memoirs.

JUSTIN.	GOSPEL.
the wicked are sent into everlasting fire.	xiii. 43. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.
κ 6. For many shall arrive in my name, outwardly, indeed, clothed in sheep's skins, but inwardly being ravening wolves.	Matt. vii. 15. But beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves.
κ 7. Ye shall know them from their works.	vii. 16. Ye shall know them by their fruit. Do men gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles?
κ 8. And every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.	vii. 19. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.
κ 1. Οὐχὶ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε, κύριε, κ.τ.λ.[1]	Matt. vii. 21. Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε, κύριε, κ.τ.λ.
κ 2. Ὃς γὰρ ἀκούει μου, καὶ ποιεῖ ἃ λέγω, ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με·[2]	Luke x. 16. Ὁ ἀκούων ὑμῶν ἐμοῦ ἀκούει, καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ· ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με·[4]
κ 3. Πολλοὶ δὲ ἐροῦσί μοι· Κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν, καὶ δυνάμεις ἐποιήσαμεν;	Matt. vii. 22. Πολλοὶ ἐροῦσίν μοι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, Κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δυνάμεις πολλὰς ἐποιήσαμεν;
κ 4. Καὶ τότε ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς. Ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἐργάται τῆς ἀνομίας.[3]	vii. 23. Καὶ τότε ὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς· ἀποχωρεῖτε

[1] This is one of the passages quoted by De Wette (*Einl. N. T.*, p. 105) as agreeing except in a single word.

[2] Justin repeats part of this passage, omitting "and doeth what I say," in *Apol.*, i. 63: "As our Lord himself also says: He that heareth me heareth him that sent me." Justin, however, merely quotes the portion relative to his subject. He is arguing that Jesus is the Word, and is called Angel and Apostle, for he declares whatever we require to know, "as our Lord himself also says," etc.; and therefore the phrase omitted is a mere suspension of the sense, and unnecessary.

[3] In *Dial.* 76, Justin makes use of a similar passage. "And many will say to me in that day: Lord, Lord, did we not eat and drink in thy name, and prophesy and cast out devils. And I will say to them Depart from me." καὶ· Πολλοὶ ἐροῦσί μοι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ· Κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ προεφητεύσαμεν καὶ δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν; Καὶ ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς· Ἀναχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. This is followed by one which differs from our Gospels in agreement with one in the *Clementine Homilies*, and by others varying also from our Gospels. Although Justin may quote these passages freely, he is persistent in his departure from our Synoptics, and the freedom of quotation is towards his own peculiar source, for it is certain that neither form agrees with the Gospels.

[4] *Cod. D.* (Bezæ) reads for the last phrase ὁ δὲ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων, ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με· but all the older MSS. have the above. A very few obscure MSS. and some translations add: "He hearing me, heareth him that sent me." καὶ ὁ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων, ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με.

Justin.	Gospel.
	ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν.[2] Matt. xiii. 42.
κ 5. Τότε κλαυθμὸς ἔσται καὶ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων· ὅταν οἱ μὲν δίκαιοι λάμψωσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος· οἱ δὲ ἄδικοι πέμπωνται εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ.	.....καὶ βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.
	43. Τότε οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμψουσιν[3] ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν.[4] Matt. vii. 15.
κ 6. Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἥξουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἔξωθεν μὲν ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων, ἔσωθεν, δὲ ὄντες λύκοι ἅρπαγες·[1]	Προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ἐνδύμασιν προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δέ εἰσιν λύκοι ἅρπαγες.
κ 7. ἐκ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς.	16. Ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς, κ.τ.λ.
κ 8. Πᾶν δὲ δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.	19. Πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.[5]
* * * *	

[1] Justin makes use of this passage with the same variations from our Gospel in *Dial.* c. *Tr.*, 35. Πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐξωθεν ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δέ εἰσι λύκοι ἅρπαγες. With only a separating καὶ, Justin proceeds to quote a saying of Jesus not found in our Gospels at all. "And: There shall be schisms and heresies," Καὶ· Εσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἱρέσεις. And then, with merely another separating "And," he quotes another passage similar to the above, but differing from Matt. "And: Beware of false prophets who shall come to you outwardly clothed in sheep's skins, but inwardly are ravening wolves,"—and with the usual separating "And," he ends with another saying not found in our Gospels: "And: Many false Christs and false Apostles shall arise, and shall deceive many of the faithful, Καὶ· Ἀναστήσονται πολλοὶ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοαπόστολοι, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν πιστῶν πλανήσουσιν. Both passages must have been in his Memoirs, and both differ from our Gospels.

[2] The parallel passage, Luke xiii. 26, 27, is still more remote. Origen in four places, in Joh. xxxii. 7, 8, *Contra Cels.*, ii. 49, *de Principiis*, quotes a passage nominally from Matt., more nearly resembling Justin's: πολλοί ἐροῦσί μοι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ· Κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐφάγομεν, καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐπίομεν, καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, κ.τ.λ. Cf. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.*, ii., p. 61 f.; Origen may have here confused the Gospel according to the Hebrews with Matthew.

[3] The *Cod. D.* (Bezæ) has λάμψωσιν, and so also quotes Origen. Cf. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.*, ii., p. 278.

[4] The corresponding passage in Luke (xiii. 26–28) much more closely follows the order which we find in Justin, but linguistically and otherwise it is remote from his version, although in connection of ideas more similar than the passage in the first Gospel. In Luke, the weeping and gnashing of teeth are to be when the wicked see the righteous in heaven whilst they are excluded; whereas in Matt. xiii. 42, 43, the weeping, etc., are merely a characteristic of the furnace of fire, and the shining forth of the righteous is mentioned as a separate circumstance. Matt. xiii. 42, 43, has a different context, and is entirely separated from the parallel passage in Justin, which precedes, and naturally introduces this quotation.

[5] This passage occurs in Matt. iii. 10 and Luke iii. 9, literally, as a saying of John the Baptist, so that in Matt. vii. 19 it is a mere quotation.

JUSTIN.	GOSPEL.
Apol., i. 17. λ. As Christ declared saying: To whom God gave more, of him shall more also be demanded again.	Luke xii. 48 (not found in Matthew). .....For unto whom much is given, of him shall much be required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will demand a greater amount.
.....ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐμήνυσεν εἰπών· Ὧι πλέον ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός, πλέον καὶ ἀπαιτηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ.[1] * * * *	Luke xii. 48. .....Παντὶ δὲ ᾧ ἐδόθη πολύ, πολὺ ζητηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ᾧ παρέθεντο πολύ, περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν[2] αὐτόν.
Dial. c. *Tr.*, 105. μ. Except your righteousness shall exceed, etc.	Matt. v. 20. For I say unto you[3] that except your righteousness shall exceed, etc.[4]

We have taken the whole of Justin's quotations from the Sermon on the Mount not only because, adopting so large a test, there can be no suspicion that we select passages for any special purpose, but also because, on the contrary, amongst these quotations are more of the passages claimed as showing the use of our Gospels than any series which could have been selected. It will have been observed that most of the passages follow each other in unbroken sequence in Justin, for with the exception of a short break between γ and δ the whole extract down to the end of θ is continuous, as indeed, after another brief interruption at the end of ι, it is again to the close of the very long and remarkable passage κ. With two exceptions, therefore, the whole of these quotations from the Sermon on the Mount occur consecutively in two succeeding chapters of Justin's first apology, and one passage follows in the next chapter. Only a single passage comes from a distant part of the dialogue with Trypho. These passages are bound together by clear unity of idea and context, and as, where there is a separation of sentences in his Gospel, Justin clearly marks it by καὶ, there is every reason to decide that those quotations which are continuous in form and in argument were likewise consecutive in the Memoirs. Now, the hypothesis that these

[1] Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata*, ii. 23, § 146) has this passage as follows: ᾧ πλεῖον ἐδόθη, οὗτος καὶ ἀπαιτηθήσεται. Cf. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.*, ii., p. 380. This version more nearly approximates to Justin's, though still distinct from it.

[2] The *Codex D.* (Bezæ) reads πλέον ἀπαιτήσουσιν instead of περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν.

[3] λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι are wanting in Justin.

[4] This passage, quoted by De Wette, was referred to p. 219, and led to this examination.

quotations are from the canonical Gospels requires the assumption that Justin, with singular care, collected from distant and scattered portions of those Gospels a series of passages in close sequence to each other, forming a whole unknown to them, but complete in itself; and yet, although this is carefully performed, he at the same time, with the most systematic carelessness, misquoted and materially altered almost every precept he professes to cite. The order of the canonical Gospels is as entirely set at naught as their language is disregarded. As Hilgenfeld has pointed out, throughout the whole of this portion of his quotations the undeniable endeavour after accuracy, on the one hand, is in the most glaring contradiction with the monstrous carelessness on the other, if it be supposed that our Gospels are the source from which Justin quotes. Nothing is more improbable than the conjecture that he made use of the canonical Gospels, and we must accept the conclusion that Justin quotes with substantial correctness the expressions in the order in which he found them in his peculiar Gospel.[1]

It is a most arbitrary proceeding to dissect a passage, quoted by Justin as a consecutive and harmonious whole, and finding parallels more or less approximate to its various phrases scattered up and down distant parts of our Gospels, scarcely one of which is not materially different from the reading of Justin, to assert that he is quoting these Gospels freely from memory, altering, excising, combining, and interweaving texts, and introverting their order, but nevertheless making use of them and not of others. It is perfectly obvious that such an assertion is nothing but the merest assumption. Our synoptic Gospels themselves condemn it utterly, for precisely similar differences of order and language exist in them and distinguish between them. Not only the language but the order of a quotation must have its due weight, and we have no right to dismember a passage and, discovering fragmentary parallels in various parts of the Gospels, to assert that it is compiled from them, and not derived, as it stands, from another source.[2]

It must have been apparent to all that, throughout his quotations from the Sermon on the Mount, Justin follows an order which is quite different from that in our synoptic Gospels; and, as might

[1] Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 129 f.; Credner, *Beitrage*, i., p. 259.

[2] For the arguments of apologetic criticism the reader may be referred to Dr. Westcott's work *On the Canon*, pp. 112–139. Dr. Westcott does not, of course, deny the fact that Justin's quotations are different from the text of our Gospels, but he accounts for his variations on grounds which seem to us purely imaginary. It is evident that, so long as there are such variations to be explained away, at least no proof of identity is possible.

have been expected, the inference of a different source, which is naturally suggested by this variation in order, is more than confirmed by persistent and continuous variations in language. If it be true that examples of confusion of quotation are to be found in the works of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and other Fathers, it must at the same time be remembered that these are quite exceptional, and we are scarcely in a position to judge how far confusion of memory may not have arisen from reminiscences of other forms of evangelical expressions occurring in apocryphal works, with which we know the Fathers to have been well acquainted. The most vehement asserter of the identity of the Memoirs with our Gospels, however, must absolutely admit as a fact, explain it as he may, that variation from our Gospel readings is the general rule in Justin's quotations, and agreement with them the very rare exception. Now, such a phenomenon is elsewhere unparalleled in those times, when memory was more cultivated than with us in these days of cheap printed books; and it is unreasonable to charge Justin with such universal want of memory and carelessness about matters which he held so sacred, merely to support a foregone conclusion, when the recognition of a difference of source, indicated in every direction, is so much more simple, natural, and justifiable. It is argued that Justin's quotations from the Old Testament likewise present constant variation from the text. This is true to a considerable extent, but they are not so persistently inaccurate as the quotations we are examining, supposing them to be derived from our Gospels. This plea, however, is of no avail, for it is obvious that the employment of the Old Testament is not established merely by inaccurate citations; and it is quite undeniable that the use of certain historical documents out of many of closely similar, and in many parts probably identical, character cannot be proved by anonymous quotations differing from anything actually in these documents.

There are very many of the quotations of Justin which bear unmistakable marks of exactness and verbal accuracy, but which yet differ materially from our Gospels, and most of his quotations from the Sermon on the Mount are of this kind. For instance, Justin introduces the passages which we have marked α, β, γ, with the words: "He (Jesus) spoke thus of Chastity";[1] and, after giving the quotations, α, β, and γ, the first two of which, although finding a parallel in two consecutive verses (Matt. v. 28, 29), are divided by the separating καὶ, and therefore do not appear to have been united in his Gospel, Justin continues: "Just as even those who, with the sanction of human law, contract a second marriage

[1] P. 220 f.

are sinners in the eye of our Master, so also are those who look upon a woman to lust after her. For not only he who actually commits adultery is rejected by him, but also he who desires to commit adultery, since not our acts alone are open before God, but also our thoughts."[1] Now, it is perfectly clear that Justin here professes to give the actual words of Jesus, and then moralises upon them; and both the quotation and his own subsequent paraphrase of it lose all their significance if we suppose that Justin did not correctly quote in the first instance, but actually commences by altering the text. These passages α, β, and γ, however, have all marked and characteristic variations from the Gospel text; but, as we have already shown, there is no reason for asserting that they are not accurate verbal quotations from another Gospel.

The passage δ is likewise a professed quotation,[2] but not only does it differ in language, but it presents deliberate transpositions in order, which clearly indicate that Justin's source was not our Gospels. The nearest parallels in our Gospels are found in Matt. v. 46, followed by 44. The same remarks apply to the next passage ε, which is introduced as a distinct quotation,[3] but which, like the rest, differs materially, linguistically and in order, from the canonical Gospels. The whole of the passage is consecutive, and excludes the explanation of a mere patchwork of passages loosely put together, and very imperfectly quoted from memory. Justin states that Jesus taught that we should communicate to those who need, and do nothing for vain glory, and he then gives the very words of Jesus in an unbroken and clearly continuous discourse. Christians are to give to all who ask, and not merely to those from whom they hope to receive again, which would be no new thing—even the publicans do that; but Christians must do more. They are not to lay up riches on earth, but in heaven, for it would not profit a man to gain the whole world, and lose his soul; therefore, the teacher a second time repeats the injunction that Christians should lay up treasures in heaven. If the unity of thought which binds this passage so closely together were not sufficient to prove that it stood in Justin's Gospel in the form and order in which he quotes it, the requisite evidence would be supplied by the repetition at its close of the injunction: "Lay up, therefore, in the heavens," etc. It is impossible that Justin should, through defect of memory, quote a second time in so short a passage the same injunction if the passage were not thus appropriately terminated in his Gospel. The common sense of the

[1] *Apol.*, i. 15. After the passages α, β, γ, and before the above, there is another quotation compared with Matt. xix. 12, but distinctly different from it.

[2] P. 221. [3] P. 222.

reader must at once perceive that it is impossible that Justin, professedly quoting words of Jesus, should thus deliberately fabricate a discourse rounded off by the repetition of one of its opening admonitions, with the addition of an argumentative "therefore." He must have found it so in the Gospel from which he quotes. Nothing indeed but the difficulty of explaining the marked variations presented by this passage, on the supposition that Justin must quote from our Gospels, could lead apologists to insinuate such a process of compilation, or question the consecutive character of this passage. The nearest parallels to the dismembered parts of the quotation, presenting everywhere serious variations, however, can only be found in the following passages in the order in which we cite them: —Matt. v. 42, Luke vi. 34, Matt. vi. 19, 20, xvi. 26, and a repetition of part of vi. 20, with variations. Moreover, the expression, "What new thing do ye?" is quite peculiar to Justin. We have already met with it in the preceding section δ. "If ye love them which love you, what *new* thing do ye? for even," etc. Here, in the same verse, we have: "If ye lend to them from whom ye hope to receive, what new thing do ye? for even," etc. It is evident, both from its repetition and its distinct dogmatic view of Christianity as a new teaching in contrast to the old, that this variation cannot have been the result of defective memory, but must have been the reading of the Memoirs, and, in all probability, it was the original form of the teaching. Such antithetical treatment is clearly indicated in many parts of the Sermon on the Mount: for instance, Matt. v. 21, "Ye have heard that it hath been said *by them of old*.....but *I* say unto you," etc., cf. v. 33, 38, 43. It is certain that the whole of the quotation ϵ differs very materially from our Gospels, and there is every reason to believe that not only was the passage not derived from them, but that it was contained in the *Memoirs of the Apostles* substantially in the form and order in which Justin quotes it.

The next passage (ζ)[1] is separated from the preceding merely by the usual καί, and it moves on to its close with the same continuity of thought and the same peculiarities of construction which characterise that which we have just considered. Christians are to be kind and merciful (χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες) to all as their Father is, who makes his sun to shine alike on the good and evil, and they need not be anxious about their own temporal necessities: what they shall eat and what put on; are they not better than the birds and beasts whom God feedeth? Therefore, they are not to be careful about what they are to eat and what put on, for their heavenly Father knows they have need of these

[1] P. 223.

things; but they are to seek the kingdom of heaven, and all these things shall be added: for where the treasure is—the thing he seeks and is careful about—there will also be the mind of the man. In fact, the passage is a suitable continuation of ε, inculcating, like it, abstraction from worldly cares and thoughts in reliance on the heavenly Father; and the mere fact that a separation is made where it is between the two passages ε and ζ shows further that each of those passages was complete in itself. There is absolutely no reason for the separating καὶ if these passages were a mere combination of scattered verses. This quotation, however, which is so consecutive in Justin, can only find distant parallels in passages widely divided throughout the synoptic Gospels, which have to be arranged in the following order:—Luke vi. 36, Matt. v. 45, vi. 25, 26, 31, 32, 33, vi. 21, the whole of which present striking differences from Justin's quotation. The repetition of the injunction "be not careful" again with the illative "therefore" is quite in the spirit of ε. This admonition, "Therefore, be not careful," etc., is reiterated no less than three times in the first Gospel (vi. 25, 31, 34), and confirms the characteristic repetition of Justin's Gospel, which seems to have held a middle course between Matthew and Luke, the latter of which does not repeat the phrase, although the injunction is made a second time in more direct terms. The repetition of the passage, "Be ye kind and merciful," etc., in *Dial.* 96, with the same context and peculiarities, is a remarkable confirmation of the natural conclusion that Justin quotes the passage from a Gospel different from ours. The expression χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες, thrice repeated by Justin himself, and supported by a similar duplication in the *Clementine Homilies* (iii. 57),[1] cannot possibly be an accidental departure from our Gospels.[2] For the rest, it is undeniable that the whole passage ζ differs materially, both in order and language, from our Gospels, from which it cannot, without unwarrantable assumption, be maintained to have been taken either collectively or in detail, and strong internal reasons lead us to conclude that it is quoted substantially as it stands from Justin's Gospel, which must have been different from our Synoptics.

In θ, again, we have an express quotation introduced by the words: "And regarding our being patient under injuries and ready to help all, and free from anger, this is what he said"; and

[1] See p. 223, note 4.

[2] Delitzsch admits the very striking nature of this triple quotation, and of another (in our passage κ 3 and 4), although he does not accept them as necessarily from a different source. "*Auffällig, aber allerdings sehr auffällig sind nur folgende 2 citate γίνεσθε χρηστοὶ κ.τ.λ.*" *Apol.*, i. 15; *Dial.* 96, *und* Κύριε, κύριε, *κ.τ.λ.* *Apol.*, i. 16; *Dial.* 76; *Unters. u. d. Entst. d. Matth. Evang.*, 1853, p. 34.

then he proceeds to give the actual words.[1] At the close of the quotation he continues: "For we ought not to strive, neither would he have us be imitators of the wicked, but he has exhorted us by patience and gentleness to lead men from shame and the love of evil," etc.[2] It is evident that these observations, which are a mere paraphrase of the text, indicate that the quotation itself is deliberate and precise. Justin professes first to quote the actual teaching of Jesus, and then makes his own comments; but if it be assumed that he began by concocting out of stray texts, altered to suit his purpose, a continuous discourse, the subsequent observations seem singularly useless and out of place. Although the passage forms a consecutive and harmonious discourse, the nearest parallels in our Gospels can only be found by uniting parts of the following scattered verses:—Matt. v. 39, 40, 22, 41, 16. The Christian who is struck on one cheek is to turn the other, and not to resist those who would take away his cloak or coat; but if, on the contrary, he be angry, he is in danger of fire; if, then, he be compelled to go one mile, let him show his gentleness by going two, and thus let his good works shine before men that, seeing them, they may adore his Father which is in heaven. It is evident that the last two sentences, which find their parallels in Matt. by putting v. 16 after 41, the former verse having quite a different context in the Gospel, must have so followed each other in Justin's text. His purpose is to quote the teaching of Jesus, "regarding our being patient under injuries, and ready to help all and free from anger"; but his quotation of "Let your good works shine before men," etc., has no direct reference to his subject, and it cannot reasonably be supposed that Justin would have selected it from a separate part of the Gospel. Coming as it no doubt did in his Memoirs in the order in which he quotes it, it is quite appropriate to his purpose. It is difficult, for instance, to imagine why Justin further omitted the injunction in the parallel passage, Matt. v. 39, "that ye resist not evil," when supposed to quote the rest of the verse, since his express object is to show that "we ought not to strive," etc. The whole quotation presents the same characteristics as those which we have already examined, and in its continuity of thought and wide variation from the parallels in our Gospels, both in order and language, we must recognise a different and peculiar source.

The passage *c*, again, is professedly a literal quotation, for Justin prefaces it with the words: "And regarding our not swearing at all, but ever speaking the truth, he taught thus"; and having in these words actually stated what Jesus did teach, he

[1] P. 224 f. [2] *Apol.*, i. 16.

proceeds to quote his very words.[1] In the quotation there is a clear departure from our Gospel, arising, not from accidental failure of memory, but from difference of source. The parallel passages in our Gospels, so far as they exist at all, can only be found by taking part of Matt. v. 34 and joining it to v. 37, omitting the intermediate verses. The quotation in the Epistle of James v. 12, which is evidently derived from a source different from Matthew, supports the reading of Justin. This, with the passage twice repeated in the *Clementine Homilies* in agreement with Justin, and, it may be added, the peculiar version found in early ecclesiastical writings,[2] all tend to confirm the belief that there existed a more ancient form of the injunction which Justin no doubt found in his Memoirs. The precept, terse, simple, and direct, as it is here, is much more in accordance with Justin's own description of the teaching of Jesus, as he evidently found it in his Gospel, than the diffused version contained in the first Gospel, v. 33–37.

Another remarkable and characteristic illustration of the peculiarity of Justin's Memoirs is presented by the long passage κ, which is also throughout consecutive and bound together by clear unity of thought.[3] It is presented with the context: "For not those who merely make professions, but those who do the works, as he (Jesus) said, shall be saved. For he spake thus."[4] It does not, therefore, seem possible to indicate more clearly the deliberate intention to quote the exact expressions of Jesus, and yet not only do we find material difference from the language in the parallel passages in our Gospels, but those parallels, such as they are, can only be made by patching together the following verses in the order in which we give them:—Matt. vii. 21, Luke x. 16, Matt. vii. 22, 23, xiii. 42, 43, vii. 15, part of 16, 19. It will be remarked that the passage (κ 2), Luke x. 16, is thrust in between two consecutive verses in Matthew, and taken from a totally different context as the nearest parallel to κ 2 of Justin, although it is widely different from it, omitting altogether the most important words: "and doeth what I say." The repetition of the same phrase, "He that heareth me heareth him that sent me," in *Apol.*, i. 63,[5] makes it certain that Justin accurately quotes his

[1] P. 225 f.

[2] P. 226, note 1.

[3] Dr. Westcott considers that "the coincidence between Justin and the Clementine Gospel illustrates still more clearly the existence of a traditional as well as of an evangelical form of Christ's words" (*On the Canon*, p. 132). But why merely a "traditional," if by that he means oral tradition? Luke i. 1 shows how many written versions there may have been; cf. Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 28 f., and anm. 1, p. 29.

[4] P. 226 ff.

[5] See p. 227, note 2.

Gospel, whilst the omission of the words in that place, "and doeth what I say," evidently proceeds from the fact that they are an interruption of the phrase for which Justin makes the quotation —namely, to prove that Jesus is sent forth to reveal the Father. It may be well to compare Justin's passage, κ 1–4, with one occurring in the so-called Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, iv. "Let us not, therefore, only call him Lord, for that will not save us. For he saith: 'Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall be saved, but he that worketh righteousness.'.....the Lord said: 'If ye be with me gathered together in my bosom, and do not my commandments, I will cast you off and say to you: Depart from me; I know you not whence you are, workers of iniquity.'" The expression ἐργάται ἀνομίας here strongly recalls the reading of Justin. This passage, which is foreign to our Gospels, at least shows the existence of others containing parallel discourses with distinct variations. Some of the quotations in this spurious Epistle are stated to be taken from the "Gospel according to the Egyptians,"[1] which was in all probability a version of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.[2] The variations which occur in Justin's repetition, in *Dial.* 76, of his quotation κ 3 are not important, because the more weighty departure from the Gospel in the words, "did we not eat and drink in thy name" (οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπιόμεν), is deliberately repeated;[3] and if, therefore, there be freedom of quotation, it is free quotation not from the canonical, but from a different Gospel. Origen's quotation[4] does not affect this conclusion, for the repetition of the phrase (οὐ) τῷ ὀνόματι σου has the form of the Gospel, and besides, which is much more important, we know that Origen was well acquainted with the Gospel according to the Hebrews and other apocryphal works from which this may have been a reminiscence. We must add, moreover, that the passage in *Dial.* 76 appears in connection with others widely differing from our Gospels. The passage κ 5 not only materially varies from the parallel in Matt. xiii. 42, 43, in language, but in connection of ideas.[5] Here also, upon examination, we must conclude that Justin quotes from a source different from our Gospels, and, moreover, that his Gospel gives with greater correctness the original form of the passage. The weeping and

[1] Cf. Clemens Al., *Strom.*, iii. 9, 63; 13, 93.

[2] Compare the quotation, *Clem. II ad Corinth.*, ii. 9, with the quotations from the Gospel according to the Hebrews in Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxx. 14.

[3] Delitzsch admits the very striking character of this repetition. *Unters. Entst. Matth. Ev.*, p. 34, see back, p. 373, note 2.

[4] Cf. p. 228, note 1.

[5] P. 228, cf. note 3.

gnashing of teeth are distinctly represented as the consequence when the wicked see the bliss of the righteous while they are sent into everlasting fire, and not as the mere characteristics of hell. It will be observed that the preceding passages, κ 3 and 4, find parallels to a certain extent in Matt. vii. 22, 23, although Luke xiii. 26, 27, is, in some respects, closer to the reading of Justin. K 5 finds no continuation of parallel in Matt. vii., from which the context comes, but we have to seek it in xiii. 42, 43. K 5, however, does find its continuing parallel in the next verse, in Luke xiii. 28, where we have "There shall be (the) weeping and (the) gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham," etc. There is here, it is evident, the connection of ideas which is totally lacking in Matt. xiii. 42, 43, where the verses in question occur as the conclusion to the exposition of the Parable of the Tares. Now, although it is manifest that Luke xiii. 28 cannot possibly have been the source from which Justin quotes, still the opening words and the sequence of ideas demonstrate the great probability that other Gospels must have given, after κ 4, a continuation which is wanting after Matt. vii. 23, but which is indicated in the parallel Luke xiii. (26, 27) 28, and is somewhat closely followed in Matt. xiii. 42, 43. When such a sequence is found in an avowed quotation from Justin's Gospel, it is certain that he must have found it there substantially as he quotes it. The passage κ 6,[1] "For many shall arrive," etc., is a very important one, and it departs emphatically from the parallel in our first Gospel. Instead of being, like the latter, a warning against false prophets, it is merely the announcement that many deceivers shall come. This passage is rendered more weighty by the fact that Justin repeats it with little variation in *Dial.* 35, and immediately after quotes a saying of Jesus of only five words which is not found in our Gospels; and then he repeats a quotation to the same effect in the shape of a warning: "Beware of false prophets," etc., like that in Matt. vii. 15, but still distinctly differing from it.[2] It is perfectly clear that Justin quotes two separate passages. It is impossible that he could intend to repeat the same quotation at an interval of only five words; it is equally impossible that, having quoted it in the one form, he could so immediately quote it in the other through error of memory. The simple, and very natural, conclusion is that he found both passages in his Gospel. The object for which he quotes would more than justify the quotation of both passages; the one referring to the many false Christians, and the other to the false prophets of whom he is speaking. That two passages so closely related should be found in the same Gospel is not in the least singular. There are

[1] P. 228. [2] Cf. p. 228, note 1.

numerous instances of the same in our Synoptics.[1] The actual facts of the case, then, are these: Justin quotes in the *Dialogue*, with the same marked deviations from the parallel in the Gospel, a passage quoted by him in the *Apology*, and after an interval of only five words he quotes a second passage to the same effect, though with very palpable difference in its character, which likewise differs from the Gospel, in company with other texts which still less find any parallels in the canonical Gospels. The two passages, by their differences, distinguish each other as separate, whilst, by their agreement in common variations from the parallel in Matthew, they declare their common origin from a special Gospel, a result still further made manifest by the agreement between the first passage in the *Dialogue* and the quotations in the *Apology*. In κ 7[2] Justin's Gospel substitutes ἔργων for καρπῶν, and is quite in the spirit of the passage θ. "Ye shall know them from their *works*" is the natural reading. The Gospel version clearly introduces "fruit" prematurely, and weakens the force of the contrast which follows. It will be observed, moreover, that, in order to find a parallel to Justin's passage κ 7, 8, only the first part of Matt. vii. 16 is taken, and the thread is only caught again at vii. 19, κ 8 being one of the two passages indicated by de Wette which we are considering, and it agrees with Matt. vii. 19, with the exception of the single word δέ. We must again point out, however, that this passage in Matt. vii. 19 is repeated no less than three times in our Gospels, a second time in Matt. iii. 10, and once in Luke iii. 19. Upon two occasions it is placed in the mouth of John the Baptist, and forms the second portion of a sentence, the whole of which is found in literal agreement both in Matt. iii. 10 and Luke iii. 9, "But now the axe is laid unto the root of the trees, therefore every tree," etc. The passage pointed out by de Wette as the parallel to Justin's anonymous quotation, Matt. vii. 19—a selection which is, of course, obligatory from the context—is itself a mere quotation by Jesus of part of the saying of the Baptist, presenting, therefore, double probability of being well known; and as we have three instances of its literal reproduction in the Synoptics, it would, indeed, be arbitrary to affirm that it was not likewise given literally in other Gospels.

The passage λ[3] is very emphatically given as a literal quotation

[1] Cf. Matt. v. 29, 30, with xviii. 8, 9.
xix. 30 with xx. 16.
xiii. 12 ,, xxv. 29.
iii. 10 ,, vii. 19.
xx. 16 ,, xxii. 14; and viii. 12, xiii. 42, 50, xxii. 13, xxiv. 51, and xxv. 30, together; Luke xiv. 11 with xviii. 14, etc.

[2] P. 228. [3] P. 229.

of the words of Jesus, for Justin cites it directly to authenticate his own statements of Christian belief. He says: "But if you disregard us both when we entreat, and when we set all things openly before you, we shall not suffer loss, believing, or rather being fully persuaded, that everyone will be punished by eternal fire, according to the desert of his deeds, and in proportion to the faculties which he received from God will his account be required, as Christ declared when he said: 'To whom God gave more, of him shall more also be demanded again.'" This quotation has no parallel in the first Gospel, but we add it here as part of the Sermon on the Mount. The passage in Luke xii. 48, it will be perceived, presents distinct variation from it, and that Gospel cannot for a moment be maintained as the source of Justin's quotation.

The last passage, μ,[1] is one of those advanced by de Wette which led to this examination.[2] It is, likewise, clearly a quotation; but, as we have already shown, its agreement with Matt. v. 20 is no evidence that it was actually derived from that Gospel. Occurring, as it does, as one of numerous quotations from the Sermon on the Mount, whose general variation, both in order and language, from the parallels in our Gospel points to the inevitable conclusion that Justin derived them from a different source, there is no reason for supposing that this sentence also did not come from the same Gospel.

No one who has attentively considered the whole of these passages from the Sermon on the Mount, and still less those who are aware of the general rule of variation in his mass of quotations as compared with parallels in our Gospels, can fail to be struck by the systematic departure from the order and language of the Synoptics. The hypothesis that they are quotations from our Gospels involves the accusation against Justin of an amount of carelessness and negligence which is quite unparalleled in literature. Justin's character and training, however, by no means warrant any such aspersion,[3] and there are no grounds for it. Indeed, but for the attempt arbitrarily to establish the identity of the *Memoirs of the Apostles* with our Gospels, such a charge would never have been thought of. It is unreasonable to suppose that avowed and deliberate quotations of sayings of Jesus, made for the express purpose of furnishing authentic written proof of Justin's statements regarding Christianity, can, as an almost invariable rule, be so singularly incorrect, more especially when it is considered that these quotations occur in an elaborate apology for Christianity addressed to the Roman emperors, and in a careful and studied

[1] P. 229. [2] Cf. p. 219.
[3] Cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 11–18.

controversy with a Jew in defence of the new faith. The simple and natural conclusion, supported by many strong reasons, is that Justin derived his quotations from a Gospel which was different from ours, although naturally, by subject and design, it must have been related to them. His Gospel, in fact, differs from our Synoptics as they differ from each other.

We now return to Tischendorf's statements with regard to Justin's acquaintance with our Gospels. Having examined the supposed references to the first Gospel, we find that Tischendorf speaks much less positively with regard to his knowledge of the other two Synoptics. He says: "There is the greatest probability that in several passages he also follows Mark and Luke."[1] First taking Mark, we find that the only example which Tischendorf gives is the following. He says: "Twice (*Dial.* 76 and 100) he quotes as an expression of the Lord: 'The Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the Scribes and Pharisees (ch. 100, by the 'Pharisees and Scribes'), and be crucified, and the third day rise again.'[2] This agrees better with Mark viii. 31 and Luke ix. 22 than with Matt. xvi. 21, only in Justin the 'Pharisees' are put instead of the 'Elders and Chief Priests' (so Matthew, Mark, and Luke), likewise 'be crucified' instead of 'be killed.'"[3] This is the only instance of similarity with Mark that Tischendorf can produce, and we have given his own remarks to show how weak his case is. The passage in Mark viii. 31 reads: "And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the Elders and the Chief Priests (ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων) and the Scribes, and be killed (καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι), and after three days (καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας) rise again." And the following is the reading of Luke ix. 22: "Saying that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the Elders and Chief Priests (ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων) and Scribes, and be killed (καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι), and the third day rise again." It will be perceived that, different as it also is, the passage in Luke is nearer than that of Mark, which cannot in any case have been the source of Justin's quotation. Tischendorf, however, does not point out that Justin, elsewhere, a third time refers to this very passage in the very same terms. He says: "And Christ.....having come .....and himself also preached, saying.....that he must suffer many things from the Scribes and Pharisees and be crucified, and

[1] *Wann Wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 28.

[2] Δει τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν Γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, καὶ σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι. *Dial.* 76 (c. 100, Φαρισαίων καὶ Γραμματέων).

[3] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 28, anm. 1.

the third day rise again."[1] Although this omits the words "and be rejected," it gives the whole of the passage literally as before. And thus there is the very remarkable testimony of a quotation three times repeated, with the same marked variations from our Gospels, to show that Justin found those very words in his Memoirs. The persistent variation clearly indicates a different source from our Synoptics. We may, in reference to this reading, compare Luke xxiv. 6: "He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee (v. 7), saying that the Son of Man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, *and be crucified*, and the third day rise again." This reference to words of Jesus, in which the words καὶ σταυρωθῆναι occurred, as in Justin, indicates that, although our Gospels do not contain it, some others may well have done so. In one place Justin introduces the saying with the following words: "For he exclaimed before the crucifixion, the Son of Man," etc.,[2] both indicating a time for the discourse and also quoting a distinct and definite saying in contradistinction to this report of the matter of his teaching, which is the form in which the parallel passage occurs in the Gospels. In Justin's Memoirs it no doubt existed as an actual discourse of Jesus, which he verbally and accurately quoted.

With regard to the third Gospel, Tischendorf says: "It is in reference to Luke (xxii. 44) that Justin recalls in the Dialogue (103) the falling drops of the sweat of agony on the Mount of Olives, and certainly with an express appeal to the 'Memoirs composed by his Apostles and their followers.'"[3] Now we have already seen[4] that Justin, in the passage referred to, does not make use of the peculiar expression which gives the whole of its character to the account in Luke, and that there is no ground for affirming that Justin derived his information from that Gospel. The only other reference to passages proving the "probability" of Justin's use of Luke or Mark is that which we have just discussed —"The Son of Man must," etc. From this the character of Tischendorf's assumptions may be inferred. De Wette does not advance any instances of verbal agreement either with Mark or Luke.[5] He says, moreover: "The historical references are much freer still (than quotations), and combine in part the accounts of Matthew and Luke; some of the kind, however, are not found at

[1] ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν Γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, καὶ σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι. *Dial.* 51. [2] *Dial.* 76.

[3] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 28, anm. 1. [4] P. 208 f.

[5] We may point out, however, that he says: "*Andere wörtliche Uebereinstimmungen kommen mitten unter Abweichungen vor, wie Apol.*, ii., p. 75, vgl. Matt. i. 21, wo Luc. i. 35, *damit combinirt ist.*" *Einl., N. T.*, p. 105; but a single phrase combined with a passage very like one in a different Gospel is a very poor argument.

all in our canonical Gospels."[1] This we have already sufficiently demonstrated.

We might now well terminate the examination of Justin's quotations, which has already taken up too much of our space; but before doing so it may be very advisable briefly to refer to another point. In his work, *On the Canon*, Dr. Westcott adopts a somewhat singular course. He evidently feels the very great difficulty in which any one who asserts the identity of the source of Justin's quotations with our Gospels is placed by the fact that, as a rule, these quotations differ from parallel passages in our Gospels; and whilst on the one hand maintaining that the quotations generally are from the canonical Gospels, he on the other endeavours to reduce the number of those which profess to be quotations at all. He says: "To examine in detail the whole of Justin's quotations would be tedious and unnecessary. It will be enough to examine (1) those which are alleged by him as quotations, and (2) those also which, though anonymous, are yet found repeated with the same variations either in Justin's own writings or (3) in heretical works. It is evidently on these quotations that the decision hangs."[2] Now under the first category Dr. Westcott finds very few. He says: In seven passages only, as far as I can discover, does Justin profess to give the exact words recorded in the Memoirs; and in these, if there be no reason to the contrary, it is natural to expect that he will preserve the exact language of the Gospels which he used, just as in anonymous quotations we may conclude that he is trusting to memory."[3] Before proceeding further, we may point out the straits to which an apologist is reduced who starts with a foregone conclusion. We have already seen a number of Justin's professed quotations; but here, after reducing the number to seven only, our critic prepares a way of escape even out of these. It is difficult to understand what "reason to the contrary" can possibly justify a man "who professes to give the exact words recorded in the Memoirs" for not doing what he professes; and, further, it passes our comprehension to understand why, in anonymous quotations, "we may conclude that he is trusting to memory." The cautious exception is as untenable as the gratuitous assumption. Dr. Westcott continues, as follows, the passage which we have just interrupted: "The result of a first view of the passages is striking. Of the seven, five agree verbally with the text of St. Matthew or St. Luke, *exhibiting indeed three slight various readings not elsewhere found, but such as are easily explicable;* the sixth is a *compound summary* of words related by St. Matthew; the seventh

[1] *Einl., N. T.*, p. 111. [2] *On the Canon*, p. 112 f. [3] *Ib.*, 114.

alone *presents an important variation in the text of a verse*, which is, however, otherwise very uncertain."[1] The italics of course are ours. The "first view" of the passages and of the above statement is indeed striking. It is remarkable how easily difficulties are overcome under such an apologetic system. The striking result, to summarise Dr. Westcott's own words, is this: out of seven professed quotations from the Memoirs, in which he admits we may expect to find the exact language preserved, five present three variations; one is a compressed summary, and does not agree verbally at all; and the seventh presents an important variation. Dr. Westcott, on the same easy system, continues: "Our inquiry is thus confined to the two last instances, and it must be seen whether their disagreement from the synoptic Gospel is such as to outweigh the agreement of the remaining five."[2] Before proceeding to consider these seven passages admitted by Dr. Westcott, we must point out that, in a note to the statement of the number, he mentions that he excludes other two passages as "not merely quotations of words, but concise narratives."[3] But surely this is a most extraordinary reason for omitting them, and one the validity of which cannot be admitted. As Justin introduces them deliberately as quotations, why should they be excluded simply because they are combined with a historical statement? We shall produce them. The first is in *Apol.*, i. 66: "For the Apostles, in the Memoirs composed by them which are called Gospels,[4] handed down that it was thus enjoined on them that Jesus, having taken bread and given thanks, said: 'This do in remembrance of me. This is my body.' And similarly, having taken the cup and given thanks, he said: 'This is my blood,' and delivered it to them alone."[5] This passage, it will be remembered, occurs in an elaborate apology for Christianity addressed to the Roman emperors, and Justin is giving an account of the most solemn sacrament of his religion. Here, if ever, we might reasonably expect accuracy and care; and Justin, in fact, carefully indicates the source of the quotation he is going to make. It is difficult to understand any ground upon which so direct a quotation from the *Memoirs of the Apostles* could be set aside by Dr. Westcott. Justin distinctly states that the Apostles in these Memoirs have "thus" (οὕτως) transmitted what was enjoined on us by Jesus, and then gives the precise quotation. Had the quotation agreed with our Gospels, would it not have been claimed as a professedly accurate quotation from them? Surely no one can reasonably pretend, for instance, that when Justin, after this preamble, states that, having taken bread, etc., *Jesus said:* "This

[1] *On the Canon*, p. 113 f. [2] *Ib.*, p. 114. [3] *Ib.*, p. 113, note 1.
[4] We have already discussed these words, p. 185 f. [5] *Apol.*, i. 66.

do in remembrance of me: this is my body"; or, having taken the cup, etc., *he said:* "This is my blood"—Justin does not deliberately mean to quote what Jesus actually did say? Now, the account of the episode in Luke is as follows (xxii. 17): "And he took a cup, gave thanks, and said: "Take this and divide it among yourselves. 18. For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God shall come. 19. And he took bread, gave thanks, brake it, and gave it unto them, saying: This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. 20. And in like manner the cup after supper, saying: This is the new covenant in my blood, which is shed for you."[1] Dr. Westcott, of course, only compares this passage of Justin with Luke, to which, and the parallel in 1 Cor. xi. 24, wide as the difference is, it is closer than to the accounts in the other two Gospels. That Justin professedly quoted literally from the Memoirs is evident, and is rendered still more clear by the serious context with which the quotation is introduced, the intention being to authenticate his explanations by actual written testimony. His dogmatic views, moreover, are distinctly drawn from a Gospel, which, in a more direct way than our Synoptics do, gave the expressions: "This is my body," and "This is my blood," and it must have been observed that Luke, with which Justin's reading alone is compared, not only has not: Τοῦτ' ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, at all, but makes use of a totally different expression: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is shed for you."

The second quotation from the Memoirs which Dr. Westcott passes over is that in *Dial.* 103, compared with Luke xxii. 42, 43,[2] on the Agony in the Garden, which we have already examined[3] and found at variance with our Gospel, and without the peculiar and distinctive expressions of the latter.

We now come to the seven passages which Dr. Westcott admits to be professed quotations from the Memoirs, and in which "it is natural to expect that he will preserve the exact words of the Gospels which he used." The first of these is a passage in the *Dialogue*, part of which has already been discussed in connection with the fire in Jordan and the voice at the Baptism, and found to be from a source different from our Synoptics.[4] Justin says: "For even he, the devil, at the time when he also (Jesus) went up from the river Jordan when the voice said to Him: 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,' is recorded in the *Memoirs of the Apostles* to have come to him and tempted him even so far as

[1] Luke xxii. 17–20; cf. Matt. xxvi. 26 ff.; Mark xiv. 22 ff.
[2] *On the Canon*, p. 113, note 1. [3] P. 208 f. [4] P. 200 ff.

saying to him: 'Worship me'; and Christ answered him (*καὶ ἀποκρίνασθαι αὐτῷ τὸν Χριστὸν*), 'Get thee behind me, Satan' (*Ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ·*), 'thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.'"[1] This passage is compared with the account of the temptation in Matt. iv. 9, 10: "And he said unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou will fall down and worship me. 10. Then saith Jesus unto him (*τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς*), Get thee hence, Satan (*Ὕπαγε Σατανᾶ·*): *it is written*, Thou shalt worship," etc. All the oldest *Codices*, it should be stated, omit the *ὀπίσω μου*, as we have done, but *Cod.* D. (Bezæ) and a few others of infirm authority insert these two words. Dr. Westcott, however, justly admits them to be "probably only a very early interpolation."[2] We have no reason for supposing that they existed in Matthew during Justin's time. The oldest *Codices* omit the whole phrase from the parallel passage, Luke iv. 8, but *Cod.* A. is an exception, and reads: *Ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ.* The best modern editions, however, reject this as a mere recent addition to Luke. A comparison of the first and third Gospels with Justin clearly shows that the Gospel which he used followed the former more closely than Luke. Matthew makes the climax of the temptation the view of all the kingdoms of the world, and the offer to give them to Jesus if he will fall down and worship Satan. Luke, on the contrary, makes the final temptation the suggestion to throw himself down from the pinnacle of the temple. Justin's Gospel, as the words, "so far as saying to him" (*μέχρι τοῦ εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ*), etc., clearly indicate, had the same climax as Matthew. Now, the following points must be observed. Justin makes the words of Satan, "Worship me" (*Προσκύνησόν μοι*), a distinct quotation; the Gospel makes Satan offer all that he had shown "if thou wilt fall down and worship me" (*ἐὰν πεσὼν προσκυνήσῃς μοι*). Then Justin's quotation proceeds: "And Christ answered him" (*καὶ ἀποκρίνασθαι αὐτῷ τὸν Χριστὸν*); whilst Matthew has: "Then Jesus saith to him" (*τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς*), which is a marked variation.[3] The *ὀπίσω μου* of Justin, as we have already said, is not found in any of the older *Codices* of Matthew. Then the words, "it is written," which form part of the reply of Jesus in our Gospels, are omitted in Justin's; but we must add that in *Dial.* 125, in again referring to the temptation, he has, "it is written." Still, in that passage he also inserts the whole phrase, "Get thee behind me, Satan," and commences: "For he answered him: It is written, Thou shalt worship," etc.

[1] *Dial.* 103.
[2] *On the Canon*, p. 113, note 2, i.
[3] Luke iv. 12 reads, *καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.*

We must, however, again point out the most important fact that this account of the temptation is directly connected with another which is foreign to our Gospels. The Devil is said to come at the time Jesus went up out of the Jordan and the voice said to him: "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee"—words which do not occur at all in our Gospels, and which are again bound up with the incident of the fire in Jordan. It is altogether unreasonable to assert that Justin could have referred the fact which he proceeds to quote from the Memoirs to the time those words were uttered, if they were not to be found in the same Memoirs. The one incident was most certainly not derived from our Gospels, inasmuch as they do not contain it, and there are the very strongest reasons for asserting that Justin derived the account of the temptation from a source which contained the other. Under these circumstances every variation is an indication, and those which we have pointed out are not accidental, but clearly exclude the assertion that the quotation is from our Gospels.

The second of the seven passages of Dr. Westcott is one of those from the Sermon on the Mount, *Dial.* 105, compared with Matt. v. 20, adduced by de Wette, which we have already considered.[1] With the exception of the opening words, λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι, the two sentences agree, but this is no proof that Justin derived the passage from Matthew; while, on the contrary, the persistent variation of the rest of his quotations from the Sermon on the Mount, both in order and language, forces upon us the conviction that he derived the whole from a source different from our Gospels.

The third passage of Dr. Westcott is that regarding the sign of Jonas the prophet, Matt. xii. 39, compared with *Dial.* 107, which was the second instance adduced by Tischendorf. We have already examined it,[2] and found that it presents distinct variations from our first Synoptic, both linguistically and otherwise, and that many reasons lead to the conclusion that it was quoted from a Gospel different from ours.

The fourth of Dr. Westcott's quotations is the following, to part of which we have already had occasion to refer:[3] "For which reason our Christ declared on earth to those who asserted that Elias must come before Christ: Elias indeed shall come (Ἠλίας μέν ἐλεύσεται), and shall restore all things: but I say unto you that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but did unto him (αὐτῷ) whatsoever they listed. And it is written that then the disciples understood that he spoke to them of John the Baptist."[4] The "express quotation" in this passage, which is compared with Matt. xvii. 11–13, is limited by Dr. Westcott to

[1] Cf. pp. 219, 240 f. [2] P. 217 f. [3] P. 200. [4] *Dial.* 49.

the last short sentence[1] corresponding with Matt. xvii. 13, and he points out that Credner admits that it must have been taken from Matthew. It is quite true that Credner considers that if any passage of Justin's quotations proves a necessary connection between Justin's Gospels and the Gospel according to Matthew, it is this sentence: "And it is written that then the disciples," etc. He explains his reason for this opinion as follows: "These words can only be derived from our Matthew, with which they literally agree; for it is thoroughly improbable that a remark of so special a description could have been made by two different and independent individuals so completely in the same way."[2] We totally differ from this argument, which is singularly opposed to Credner's usual clear and thoughtful mode of reasoning. No doubt, if such Gospels could be considered to be absolutely distinct and independent works, deriving all their matter from individual and separate observation of the occurrences narrated by their authors and personal report of the discourses given, there might be greater force in the argument, although even in that case it would have been far from conclusive here, inasmuch as the observation we are considering is the mere simple statement of a fact necessary to complete the episode, and it might well have been made in the same terms by separate reporters. Now, such an expression as Matt. xvii. 13 in some early record of the discourse might have been transferred to a dozen of other Christian writings. Ewald assigns the passage to the oldest Gospel, Matthew, in its present form, being fifth in descent.[3]

Our three canonical Gospels are filled with instances in which expressions still more individual are repeated, and these show that such phrases cannot be limited to one Gospel; but, if confined in the first instance to one original source, may have been transferred to many subsequent evangelical works. Take, for instance, a passage in Matt. vii. 28, 29: ".....the multitudes were astonished at his teaching: for he taught them as having authority, and not as their scribes."[4] Mark i. 22 has the very same passage,[5] with the mere omission of "the multitude" (*οἱ ὄχλοι*), which does not in the least affect the argument; and Luke iv. 32: "And they were astonished at his teaching: for his word was power."[6]

[1] *On the Canon*, p. 114, note 4.

[2] Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 237.

[3] *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 34, cf. p. 1; *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, 1849, p. 190 ff.

[4] .....*ἐξεπλήσσοντο οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν.* Matt. vii. 28, 29.

[5] The final *αὐτῶν* is omitted from the end of the passage in Matthew in many MSS., and added by others in Mark.

[6] *καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.* Luke iv. 32.

Although the author of the third Gospel somewhat alters the language, it is clear that he follows the same original, and retains it in the same context as the second Gospel. Now the occurrence of such a passage as this in one of the Fathers, if either the first or second Gospels were lost, would, on Credner's grounds, be attributed undoubtedly to the survivor, although in reality derived from the Gospel no longer extant, which likewise contained it. Another example may be pointed out in Matt. xiii. 34: "All these things spake Jesus unto the multitudes in parables; and *without a parable spake he not unto them*," compared with Mark iv. 33, 34, "And with many such parables spake he the word unto them..... and without a parable spake he not unto them." The part of this very individual remark which we have italicised is literally the same in both Gospels, as a personal comment at the end of the parable of the grain of mustard seed. Then, for instance, in the account of the sleep of the three disciples during the Agony in the Garden (Matt. xxvi. 43, Mark xiv. 40), the expression, "and he found them asleep, *for their eyes were heavy*," which is equally individual, is literally the same in the first two Gospels. Another special remark of a similar kind regarding the rich young man, "He went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions," is found both in Matt. xix. 22 and Mark x. 22. Such examples[1] might be multiplied, and they show that the occurrence of passages of the most individual character cannot, in Justin's time, be limited to any single Gospel.

Now, the verse we are discussing, Matt. xvii. 13, in all probability, as Ewald supposes, occurred in one or more of the older forms of the Gospel from which our Synoptics, and many other similar works, derived their matter, and nothing is more likely than that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which in many respects was nearly related to Matthew, may have contained it. At any rate, we have shown that such sayings cannot, however apparently individual, be considered evidence of the use of a particular Gospel simply because it happens to be the only one now extant which contains it. Credner, however, whilst expressing the opinion which we have quoted, likewise adds his belief that by the expression, καὶ γέγραπται, Justin seems expressly to indicate that this sentence is taken from a different work from what precedes it, and he has proved that the preceding part of the quotation was not derived from our Gospels.[2] We cannot, however, coincide with this opinion either. It seems to us that the expression, "and

[1] Cf. Matt. iii. 3, Mark i. 2, 3, Luke iii. 4; Matt. iii. 5, 6, Mark i. 5; Matt. xiv. 3, 4, Mark vi. 17, 18; Matt. xiv. 9, Mark vi. 26; Matt. xxviii. 14, Mark xv. 5; Matt. xxvii. 39, Mark xv. 29, etc.

[2] Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 237.

it is written," simply was made use of by Justin to show that the identification of Elias with John the Baptist is not his, but was the impression conveyed at the time by Jesus to his disciples. Now, the whole narrative of the baptism of John in Justin bears characteristic marks of being from a Gospel different from ours,[1] and in the first part of this very quotation we find distinct variation. Justin first affirms that Jesus in his teaching had proclaimed that Elias should also come (καὶ Ἠλίαν ἐλεύσεσθαι), and then further on he gives the actual words of Jesus: Ἠλίας μὲν ἐλεύσεται, κ.τ.λ., which we have before us, whilst in Matthew the words are: Ἠλίας μὲν ἔρχεται, and there is no MS. which reads ἐλεύσεται for ἔρχεται; and yet, as Credner remarks, the whole force of the quotation rests upon the word, and Justin is persistent in his variation from the text of our first Synoptic. It is unreasonable to say that Justin quotes loosely the important part of his passage, and then about a few words at the close pretends to be so particularly careful. Considering all the facts of the case, we must conclude that this quotation also is from a source different from our Gospels.

Another point, however, must be noted. Dr. Westcott claims this passage as an express quotation from the Memoirs, apparently for no other reason than that the few words happen to agree with Matt. xvii. 13, and that he wishes to identify the Memoirs with our Gospels. Justin, however, does not once mention the Memoirs in this chapter; it follows, therefore, that Dr. Westcott, who is so exceedingly strict in his limitation of express quotations, assumes that all quotations of Christian history and words of Jesus in Justin are to be considered as derived from the Memoirs, whether they be mentioned by name or not. We have already seen that amongst these there are not only quotations differing from the Gospels, and contradicting them, but others which have no parallels at all in them.

The fifth of Dr. Westcott's express quotations occurs in *Dial.* 105, where Justin says: "For when he (Jesus) was giving up his spirit on the cross he said: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,' as I have also learned from the Memoirs." This short sentence agrees with Luke xxiii. 46, it is true; but, as we have already shown,[2] Justin's whole account of the Crucifixion differs so materially from that in our Gospels that it cannot have been derived from them.

We see this forcibly in examining the sixth of Dr. Westcott's quotations, which is likewise connected with the Crucifixion. "For they who saw him crucified also wagged their heads, each one of them, and distorted their lips, and sneeringly, and in scornful

[1] P. 200 ff. [2] P. 213 f.

irony, repeated among themselves those words which are also written in the Memoirs of his Apostles: He declared himself the son of God: (let him) come down, let him walk about: let God save him."[1] We have ourselves already quoted and discussed this passage,[2] and need not further examine it here. Dr. Westcott has nothing better to say regarding this quotation, in an examination of the accuracy of parallel passages, than this: "These exact words do not occur in our Gospels, but we do find there others so closely connected with them that few readers would feel the difference"![3] When criticism descends to language like this, the case is, indeed, desperate. It is clear that, as Dr. Westcott admits, the words are expressly declared to be a quotation from the *Memoirs of the Apostles*, but they do not exist in our Gospels, and consequently our Gospels are not identical with the Memoirs. Dr. Westcott refers to the taunts in Matthew, and then, with commendable candour, he concludes his examination of the quotation with the following words: "No manuscript or Father (so far as we know) has preserved any reading of the passage more closely resembling Justin's quotation; and if it appear not to be deducible from our Gospels, due allowance being made for the object which he had in view, its source must remain concealed."[4] We need only add that it is futile to talk of making "due allowance" for the object which Justin had in view. His immediate object was accurate quotation, and no allowance can account for such variation in language and thought as is presented in this passage. That this passage, though a professed quotation from the Memoirs, is not taken from our Gospels is certain, both from its own variations and the differences in other parts of Justin's account of the Crucifixion, an event whose solemnity and importance might well be expected to secure reverential accuracy. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that Justin's *Memoirs of the Apostles* were not identical with our Gospels, and the systematic variation of his quotations thus receives its natural and reasonable explanation.

The seventh and last of Dr. Westcott's express quotations is, as he states, "more remarkable." We subjoin the passage in contrast with the parallel texts of the first and third Gospels:—

JUSTIN, DIAL. 100.	MATT. XI. 27.	LUKE X. 22.
And in the Gospel it is written that he said:		
All things have been delivered to me by the	All things were delivered to me by the[5]	All things were delivered to me by my

[1] *Dial.* 101. [2] P. 211 f.
[3] *On the Canon*, p. 114 f. [4] *Ib.*, p. 115.
[5] Most Codices read "my," but the *Cod. Sin.* having "the," we give it as more favourable.

JUSTIN, DIAL. 100.	MATT. XI. 27.	LUKE X. 22.
Father, and no one knoweth (γινώσκει) the Father but the Son, nor the Son but the Father and	Father, and no one knoweth (ἐπιγινώσκει) the Son but the Father, nor knoweth (ἐπιγινώσκει) anyone the Father but the Son, and he	Father, and no one knoweth (γινώσκει) who the Son is but the Father, and who the Father is but the Son,
those to whomsoever the Son shall reveal him.	to whomsoever the Son is minded to reveal him.	and he to whomsoever the Son is minded to reveal him.
Καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ γέγραπται εἰπών· Πάντα μοι παραδέδοται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός· οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ παπὴρ καὶ οἷς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.	Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός,[1] καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.	Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατήρ, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

It is apparent that Justin's quotation differs very materially from our Gospels in language, in construction, and in meaning. These variations, however, acquire very remarkable confirmation and significance from the fact that Justin in two other places[2] quotes the latter and larger part of the passage from οὐδείς in precisely the same way, with the sole exception that, in both of these quotations, he used the aorist ἔγνω instead of γινώσκει. This threefold repetition in the same peculiar form clearly stamps the passage as being a literal quotation from his Gospel, and the one exception to the verbal agreement of the three passages, in the substitution of the present for the aorist in the *Dialogue*, does not remove or lessen the fundamental variation of the passage from our Gospel. As the ἔγνω is twice repeated, it was probably the reading of his text. Now it is well known that the peculiar form of the quotation in Justin occurred in what came to be considered heretical Gospels, and constituted the basis of important Gnostic doctrines.[3] Dr. Westcott speaks of the use of this passage by the Fathers in agreement with Justin in a manner which, unintentionally we have no doubt, absolutely misrepresents important facts. He says: "The transposition of the words still remains; and how little weight can be attached to that will appear upon an examination of the various forms in which the text is quoted by Fathers like Origen, Irenæus, and Epiphanius, who admitted our Gospels exclusively. It occurs

[1] See last note.

[2] *Apol.*, i. 63.

[3] Dr. Westcott merely alludes to this in the briefest way in a note (*On the Canon*, p. 115, note 2).

in them as will be seen from the table of readings[1] with almost every possible variation. Irenæus in the course of one chapter quotes the verse first as it stands in the canonical text; then in the same order, but with the last clause like Justin's; and once again altogether as he has given it. Epiphanius likewise quotes the text seven times in the same order as Justin, and four times as it stands in the Gospels."[2] Now in the chapter to which reference is made in this sentence Irenæus commences by stating that the Lord had declared: "*Nemo cognoscit Filium nisi Pater; neque Patrem quis cognoscit nisi Filius, et cui voluerit Filius revelare*,"[3] as he says, "Thus Matthew has set it down and Luke similarly, and Mark the very same."[4] He goes on to state, however, that those who would be wiser than the Apostles write this verse as follows: "*Nemo cognovit Patrem nisi Filius; nec Filium nisi Pater, et cui voluerit Filius revelare.*" And he explains: "They interpret it as though the true God was known to no man before the coming of our Lord; and that God who was announced by the Prophets they affirm not to be the Father of Christ."[5] Now in this passage we have the ἔγνω of Justin in the "*cognovit*," in contradistinction to the "*cognoscit*" of the Gospel, and his transposition of order as not by any possibility an accidental thing, but as the distinct basis of doctrines. Irenæus goes on to argue that no one can know the Father unless through the Word of God, that is through the Son, and this is why he said: "'*Nemo cognoscit Patrem nisi Filius; neque Filium nisi Pater, et quibuscunque Filius revelaverit.*' Thus teaching that he himself also is the Father, as indeed he is, in order that we may not receive any other Father except him who is revealed by the Son."[6] In this third quotation Irenæus alters the ἔγνω into γινώσκει, but retains the form, for the rest, of the Gnostics and of Justin, and his aim apparently is to show that, adopting his present tense instead of the aorist, the transposition of words is of no importance. A fourth time, however, in the same chapter, which in fact is wholly dedicated to this passage and to the doctrines based upon it, Irenæus quotes the saying: "*Nemo cognoscit Filium nisi Pater; neque Patrem nisi Filius, et quibuscunque Filius revelaverit.*"[7] Here the language and order of the

[1] In the few readings given in this table, Dr. Westcott does not distinguish the writers at all. Cf. *On the Canon*, p. 116, note 3.

[2] *On the Canon*, p. 116. [3] *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 6, § 1.

[4] *Sic et Matthæus posuit, et Lucas similiter, et Marcus idem ipsum.* We need not point out that this is a misstatement, for our Mark has not got the passage at all.

[5] "*Et interpretantur, quasi a nullo cognitus sit verus Deus ante Domini nostri adventum: et eum Deum, qui a prophetis sit annuntiatus, dicunt non esse Patrem Christi.*" *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 6, § 1.

[6] *Docens semetipsum et Patrem, sicut est, ut alterum non recipiamus Patrem, nisi eum qui a Filio revelatur. Ib.*, iv. 6, § 3. [7] *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 6, § 7.

Gospel are followed with the exception that "*cui voluerit revelare*" is altered to the "*quibuscunque revelaverit*" of Justin; and that this is intentional is made clear by the continuation: "For *revelaverit* was said not with reference to the future alone,"[1] etc.

Now, in this chapter we learn very clearly that, although the canonical Gospels, by the express declaration of Irenæus, had their present reading of the passage before us, other Gospels of considerable authority even in his time had the form of Justin, for again, in a fifth passage, he quotes the opening words: "He who was known, therefore, was not different from him who declared: 'No one knoweth the Father,' but one and the same."[2] With the usual alteration of the verb to the present tense, Irenæus, in this and in one of the other quotations of this passage just cited, gives some authority to the transposition of the words "Father" and "Son," although the reading was opposed to the Gospels; but he invariably adheres to γινώσκει and condemns ἔγνω, the reading maintained by those who, in the estimation of Irenæus, "would be wiser than the Apostles." Elsewhere, descanting on the passages of Scripture by which heretics attempt to prove that the Father was unknown before the advent of Christ, Irenæus, after accusing them of garbling passages of Scripture,[3] goes on to say of the Marcosians and others: "Besides these, they adduce a countless number of apocryphal and spurious works which they themselves have forged to the bewilderment of the foolish, and of those who are not versed in the Scriptures of truth."[4] He also points out passages occurring in our Gospels to which they give a peculiar interpretation, and, among these, that quoted by Justin. He says: "But they adduce as the highest testimony, and, as it were, the crown of their system, the following passage. ....." All things were delivered to me by my Father, and no one knew (ἔγνω) the Father but the Son, and the Son but the Father, and he to whomsoever (ᾧ ἂν) the Son shall reveal (ἀποκαλύψῃ)."[5]

[1] *Revelaverit enim, non solum in futurum dictum est*, etc.; *Ib.*, iv. 6, § 7.

[2] *Non ergo alius erat qui cogn oscebatur, et alius qui dicebat:* "*Nemo cognoscit Patrem:*" *sed unus et id em, etc.; Ib.*, iv. 6, § 7. In another place Irenæus again quotes the passage in the same order, with the same careful adherence to the present tense. *Adv. Hær.*, ii. 6, § 1.

[3] *Adv. Hær.*, i. 19, § 1.

[4] Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἀμύθητον πλῆθος ἀποκρύφων καὶ νόθων γραφῶν, ἃς αὐτοὶ ἔπλασαν, παρεισφέρουσιν εἰς κατάπληξιν τῶν ἀνοήτων καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας μὴ ἐπισταμένων γράμματα. *Adv. Hær.*, i. 20, § 1.

[5] *Adv. Hær.*, i. 20, § 3. And again, referring to Valentinus and his followers, and endeavouring to show the inconsistency of their views, he says: "*Salvator ergo, secundum eos, erit mentitus, dicens:* '*Nemo cognovit Patrem nisi Filius.*' *Si enim cognitus est vel a matre, vel a semine ejus: solutum est illud, quod,* '*nemo cognovit Patrem nisi Filius.*'" *Adv. Hær.*, ii. 14, § 7. Irenæus then endeavours out of their own form of the text to confute their doctrines.

In these words they assert that he clearly demonstrated that the Father of truth whom they have invented was known to no one before his coming; and they desire to interpret the words as though the Maker and Creator had been known to all, and the Lord spoke these words regarding the Father unknown to all, whom they proclaim."[1] Here we have the exact quotation twice made by Justin, with the ἔγνω and the same order, set forth as the reading of the Gospels of the Marcosians and other sects, and the highest testimony to their system. It is almost impossible that Justin could have altered the passage by an error of memory to this precise form, and it must be regarded as the reading of his Memoirs. The evidence of Irenæus is clear: The Gospels had the reading which we now find in them, but apocryphal Gospels, on the other hand, had that which we find twice quoted by Justin, and the passage was, as it were, the text upon which a large sect of the early Church based its most fundamental doctrine. The ἔγνω is invariably repudiated, but the transposition of the words "Father" and "Son" was apparently admitted to a certain extent, although the authority for this was not derived from the Gospels recognised by the Church, which contained the contrary order.

We must briefly refer to the use of this passage by Clement of Alexandria. He quotes portions of the text eight times, and, although with some variation of terms, he invariably follows the order of the Gospels. Six times he makes use of the aorist ἔγνω,[2] once of γινώσκει,[3] and once of ἐπιγινώσκει.[4] He only once quotes the whole passage;[5] but on this occasion, as well as six others in which he only quotes the latter part of the sentence,[6] he omits βούληται, and reads "and he to whom the Son shall reveal," thus supporting the ἀποκαλύψῃ of Justin. Twice he has "God" instead of "Father,"[7] and once he substitutes μηδείς for οὐδείς.[8] It is evident, from the loose and fragmentary way in which Clement interweaves the passage with his text, that he is more concerned with the sense than the verbal accuracy of the quotation; but the result of his evidence is that he never departs from the Gospel order of "Father" and "Son," although he frequently makes use of ἔγνω and also employs ἀποκαλύψῃ in agreement with Justin, and, therefore, he shows the prevalence of forms approximating to, though always presenting material difference from, the reading of Justin.

[1] *Adv. Hær.*, i. 20, § 3.
[2] *Pæd.*, i. 9, § 88; i. 5, § 20; *Strom.*, i. 28, § 178; v. 13, § 95; vii. 10, 58; *Cohort.*, i. 10.
[3] *Strom.*, vii. 18, § 109.
[4] *Quis Div. Salv.*, 9.
[5] *Strom.*, i. 28, § 178.
[6] *Coh.*, i., § 10; *Pæd.*, i. 5, § 20; *Strom.*, v. 13, § 85; vii. 10, § 58; vi. 18, § 109; *Quis Div. Salv.*, 8.
[7] *Coh.*, i., § 10; *Pæd.*, i. 5, § 20.
[8] *Strom.*, v. 13, § 85.

Epiphanius refers to this passage no less than ten times,[1] but he only quotes it fully five times, and upon each of these occasions with variations. Of the five times to which we refer, he thrice follows the order of the Gospels,[2] as he does likewise in another place where he does not complete the sentence.[3] On the remaining two occasions he adopts the same order as Justin, with variations from his readings, however, to which we shall presently refer;[4] and where he only partially quotes he follows the same order on other three occasions,[5] and in one other place the quotation is too fragmentary to allow us to distinguish the order.[6] Now, in all of these ten quotations, with one exception, Epiphanius substitutes οἶδε for ἐπιγινώσκει at the commencement of the passage in Matthew, and only thrice does he repeat the verb in the second clause as in that Gospel, and on these occasions he twice makes use of οἶδε[7] and once of ἔγνω.[8] He once uses ἔγνω with the same order as Justin, but does not complete the sentence.[9] Each time he completes the quotation he uses ᾧ ἐὰν with the Gospel, and ἀποκαλύψῃ with Justin;[10] but only once out of the five complete quotations does he insert ὁ υἱὸς in the concluding phrase. It is evident from this examination, which we must not carry further, that Epiphanius never verbally agrees with the Gospel in his quotation of this passage, and never verbally with Justin, but mainly follows a version different from both. It must be remembered, however, that he is writing against various heresies, and it does not seem to us improbable that he reproduces forms of the passage current amongst those sects.

In his work against Marcion, Tertullian says: "With regard to the Father, however, that he was never seen, the Gospel which is common to us will testify, as it was said by Christ: *Nemo cognovit patrem nisi filius*,"[11] but elsewhere he translates "*Nemo scit*,"[12] evidently not fully appreciating the difference of ἔγνω.[13] The passage in Marcion's Gospel reads like Justin's: οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱόν τις γινώσκει, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.[14] The use of ἔγνω as applied to the Father and γινώσκει as regards the Son in this passage is suggestive. Origen almost

[1] *Hær.*, liv. 4, ed. *Petav.*, p. 466; lxiv. 9, p. 532; xlv. 6, p. 613; lxix. 43, p. 766; lxxiv. 4, p. 891, 10, p. 898; lxxvi. 7, p. 943, 29, p. 977, 32, p. 981.
[2] *Hær.*, lxxvi. 7, p. 943; liv. 4, p. 466; lxv. 6, p. 613.
[3] *Hær.*, lxvi. 9, p. 532.
[4] *Hær.*, lxxiv. 4, p. 891; lxxvi. 29, p. 977.
[5] *Hær.*, lxix. 43, p. 766; lxxiv. 10, p. 898; lxxvi. 32, p. 981.
[6] *Hær.*, lxxvi. 32, p. 981.
[7] *Hær.*, liv. 4, p. 466; lxix. 43, p. 766.
[8] *Hær.*, lxv. 6, p. 613.
[9] *Hær.*, lxxiv. 10, p. 898.
[10] Except once when he has ἀποκαλύπτει. *Hær.*, lxxiv. 4, p. 891.
[11] *Adv. Marc.*, ii. 27.
[12] *Ib.*, iv. 25, cf. 6.
[13] Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 202 f.
[14] *Dial. de recta in Deum fide*, 1; Origen, *Op.*, i., p. 817 D; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 433; Hahn, *Das Evang. Marcions*, p. 160.

invariably uses ἔγνω, sometimes adopting the order of the Gospels and sometimes that of Justin, and always employing ἀποκαλύψῃ.[1] The *Clementine Homilies* always read ἔγνω, and always follow the same order as Justin, presenting other and persistent variations from the form in the Gospels. Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, ὡς οὐδὲ τὸν υἱόν τις εἶδεν[2] εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ οἷς ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.[3] This reading occurs four times. The *Clementine Recognitions* have the aorist with the order of the Gospels.[4]

There only remain a few more lines to add to those already quoted to complete the whole of Dr. Westcott's argument regarding this passage. He continues and concludes thus: "If, indeed, Justin's quotations were made from memory, no transposition could be more natural; and if we suppose that he copied the passage directly from a manuscript, there is no difficulty in believing that he found it so written in a manuscript of the canonical St. Matthew, since the variation is excluded by no internal improbability, while it is found elsewhere, and its origin is easily explicable."[5] It will be observed that Dr. Westcott does not attempt any argument, but simply confines himself to suppositions. If such explanations were only valid, there could be no difficulty in believing anything, and every embarrassing circumstance would be easily explicable.

The facts of the case may be briefly summed up as follows: Justin deliberately and expressly quotes from his Gospel, himself calling it "Gospel," be it observed, a passage whose nearest parallel in our Gospels is Matt. xi. 27. This quotation presents material variations from our canonical Gospel, both in form and language. The larger part of the passage he quotes twice in a different work, written years before, in precisely the same words as the third quotation, with the sole exception that he uses the aorist instead of the present tense of the verb. No MS. of our Gospel extant approximates to the reading in Justin, and we are expressly told by Irenæus that the present reading of our Matthew was that existing in his day. On the other hand, Irenæus states with equal distinctness that Gospels used by Gnostic sects had the reading of Justin, and that the passage was "the crown of their system," and one upon whose testimony they based their leading doctrines. Here, then, is the clear statement that Justin's quotation disagrees with the form in the Gospels, and agrees with that of other Gospels. The variations occurring in the numerous quotations of

[1] Cf. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.*, ii., pp. 271, 373.
[2] Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 250.
[3] *Clem. Hom.*, xvii. 4; xviii. 4, 13, 20; xviii. 11.
[4] *Clem. Recog.*, ii. 47. [5] *On the Canon*, p. 117.

the same passage by the Fathers, which we have analysed, show that they handled it very loosely, but also indicate that there must have been various readings of considerable authority then current. It has been conjectured with much probability that the form in which Justin quotes the passage twice in his *Apology* may have been the reading of older Gospels, and that it was gradually altered by the Church to the form in which we now have it for dogmatic reasons, when Gnostic sects began to base doctrines upon it inconsistent with the prevailing interpretation.[1] Be this as it may, Justin's Gospel clearly had a reading different from ours, but in unison with that known to exist in other Gospels, and this express quotation only adds additional proof to the mass of evidence already adduced that the *Memoirs of the Apostles* were not our canonical Gospels.

We have already occupied so much space even with this cursory examination of Justin's quotations that we must pass over in silence passages which he quotes from the Memoirs with variations from the parallels in our Gospels, which are also found in the *Clementine Homilies* and other works emanating from circles in which other Gospels than ours were used. We shall now only briefly refer to a few sayings of Jesus, expressly quoted by Justin, which are altogether unknown to our Gospels. Justin says: "For the things which he foretold would take place in his name, these we see actually coming to pass in our sight. For he said: 'Many shall come," etc.,[2] and 'There shall be schisms and heresies,'[3] and 'Beware of false prophets,'[4] etc., and 'Many false Christs and false Apostles shall arise and shall deceive many of the faithful.'"[5] Neither of the two prophecies here quoted is to be found anywhere in our Gospels, and to the second of them Justin repeatedly refers. He says in one place that Jesus "foretold that in the interval of his coming, as I previously said,[6] heresies and false prophets would arise in his name."[7] It is admitted that these prophecies are foreign to our Gospels. It is very probable that the Apostle Paul refers to the prophecy, "There shall be schisms and heresies" in 1 Cor. xi. 18–19, where it is said, ".....I hear that schisms exist amongst you; and I partly believe it. For there

[1] Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i., p. 254 ff. Cf. Credner, *Beitrage*. i., p. 250 f. Delitzsch, *N. Unters. Kan. Evv.*, p. 35 f. Scholten, *Het Paulin. Evangelie*, 1870, p. 103 f.

[2] Cf. p. 228, note 4, p. 238 f.

[3] εἶπε γάρ.....Ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἱρέσεις. *Dial.* 35.

[4] Cf. 228, note 4, p. 238 f.

[5] Ἀναστήσονται πολλοὶ ψευδόχριστοι, καὶ ψευδαπόστολοι καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν πιστῶν πλανήσουσιν. *Dial.* 35. ; cf. *Apol.*, i. 12.

[6] *Dial.* 35.

[7] Καὶ ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ χρόνῳ, ὡς προέφην, γενήσεσθαι αἱρέσεις καὶ ψευδοπροφήτας ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ προεμήνυσε, κ.τ.λ. *Dial.* 51 ; cf. 82.

must also be heresies amongst you," etc. (ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχειν, καὶ μέρος τι πιστεύω. δεῖ γὰρ καὶ αἱρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, κ.τ.λ.) We find also, elsewhere, traces both of this saying and that which accompanies it. In the *Clementine Homilies*, Peter is represented as stating, "For there shall be, as the Lord said, *false apostles*, false prophets, *heresies*, desires for supremacy," etc. (ἔσονται γάρ, ὡς ὁ κύριος εἶπεν, ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδεῖς προφῆται, αἱρέσεις, φιλαρχίαι, κ.τ.λ.[1] We are likewise reminded of the passage in the Epistle attributed to the Roman Clement, xliv.: "Our Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be contention regarding the dignity of the episcopate."[2] In our Gospel there is no reference anywhere to schisms and heresies, nor are false Apostles once mentioned, the reference being solely to "false Christs" and "false prophets." The recurrence here and elsewhere of the peculiar expression "false apostles" is very striking,[3] and the evidence for the passage as a saying of Jesus is important. Hegesippus, after enumerating a vast number of heretical sects and teachers, continues: "From these sprang the false Christs, false prophets, *false apostles*, who divided the union of the Church by corrupting doctrines concerning God and concerning his Christ."[4] It will be remembered that Hegesippus made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and the *Clementine* literature points to the same source. In the *Apostolic Constitutions* we read: "For these are false Christs and false prophets, and *false apostles*, deceivers, and corrupters," etc.,[5] and in the *Clementine Recognitions* the Apostle Peter is represented as saying that the Devil, after the temptation, terrified by the final answer of Jesus, "hastened immediately to send forth into this world false prophets, and *false apostles*, and false teachers, who should speak in the name of Christ indeed, but should perform the will of the demon."[6] Justin's whole system forbids our recognising in these two passages mere tradition, and we must hold that we have here quotations from a Gospel different from ours.

Elsewhere, Justin says: "Out of which (affliction and fiery trial of the Devil) again Jesus, the Son of God, promised to deliver us, and to put on us prepared garments, if we do his commandments, and he is proclaimed as having provided an eternal kingdom for us."[7] This promise is nowhere found in our Gospel.

Immediately following the passage (κ 3 and 4) which we have discussed[8] as repeated in the *Dialogue*: "Many shall say to me,

[1] *Hom.*, xvi. 21. [2] xliv. See Greek passage quoted, p. 136, note 3.
[3] Semisch, *Die Ap. Denkw. d. Märt. Just.*, p. 391, anm. 2.
[4] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 22. [5] *Constit. Apost.*, vi. 13; cf. vi. 18.
[6] *Recog.*, iv. 34. [7] *Dial.* 116. [8] P. 227, note 4.

etc., and I will say to them, 'Depart from me,'" Justin continues: "And in other words by which he will condemn those who are unworthy to be saved, he said that he will say: Begone into the darkness without, which the Father hath prepared for Satan and his angels."[1] The nearest parallel to this is in Matt. xxv. 41: Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand: Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels."

Justin, Dial. 76.	Matt. xxv. 41.
Καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις λόγοις οἷς καταδικάζειν τοὺς ἀναξίους μὴ σώζεσθαι μέλλει, ἔφη ἐρεῖν· Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, ὃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ πατὴρ τῷ Σατανᾷ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.	Τότε ἐρεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἐξ εὐωνύμων Πορεύεσθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ κατηραμένοι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.

It is apparent that Justin's quotation differs very widely from the reading of our Gospel. The same reading, with the exception of a single word, is found in the *Clementine Homilies* (xix. 2); that is to say, that "Devil" is substituted for "Satan," and this variation is not important. The agreement of the rest, on the other hand, seems to establish the conclusion that the quotation is from a written Gospel different from ours, and here we have further strong indications of Justin's use of the Ebionite Gospel.

Another of the sayings of Jesus which are foreign to our Gospels is one in reference to the man who falls away from righteousness into sin, of whom Justin says: "Wherefore also our Lord Jesus Christ said: In whatsoever things I may find you, in these I shall also judge you."[2] (Διὸ καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἶπεν· "Ἐν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.") A similar expression is used by some of the Fathers, and, in some cases, is ascribed to the prophets.[3] Clement of Alexandria has quoted a phrase closely resembling this without indicating the source. Ἐφ' οἷς γὰρ ἂν εὕρω ὑμᾶς, φησὶν, ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.[4] Grabe was of opinion that Justin derived the passage from the Gospel according to the Hebrews,[5] an opinion shared by the greater number of modern critics, and which we are prepared to accept from many previous instances of agreement. Even the warmest asserters of the theory that the Memoirs are identical with our Gospels are obliged to admit that this saying of Jesus is not contained in them, and that it must have been derived from an extra-canonical source.

Other passages of a similar kind might have been pointed out,

[1] *Dial.* 76. [2] *Ib.* 47.

[3] Grabe, *Spicil. patr.*, i., p. 327; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 333 f., ii., p. 524.

[4] *Quis Div. Salv.*, 40. [5] *Spicil. Patr.*, i., p. 14, p. 327.

but we have already devoted too much space to Justin's quotations, and must hasten to a conclusion. There is one point, however, to which we must refer. We have more than once alluded to the fact that, unless in one place, Justin never mentions an author's name in connection with the *Memoirs of the Apostles*. The exception to which we referred is the following:—Justin says: "The statement also that he (Jesus) changed the name of Peter, one of the Apostles, and that this is also written in *his* Memoirs as having been done, together with the fact that he also changed the name of other two brothers, who were sons of Zebedee, to Boanerges; that is, sons of Thunder," etc.[1] According to the usual language of Justin, and upon strictly critical grounds, the αὐτοῦ in this passage must be referred to Peter; and Justin, therefore, seems to ascribe the Memoirs to that Apostle, and to speak of a Gospel of Peter.[2] Some critics maintain that the αὐτοῦ does not refer to Peter, but to Jesus, or, more probable still, that it should be amended to αὐτῶν, and apply to the Apostles. The great majority, however, are forced to admit the reference of the Memoirs to Peter, although they explain it, as we shall see, in different ways. It is argued by some that this expression is used when Justin is alluding to the change of name, not only of Peter, but of the sons of Zebedee, the narrative of which is only found in the Gospel according to Mark. Now, Mark was held by many of the Fathers to have been the mere mouthpiece of Peter, and to have written at his dictation;[3] so that, in fact, in calling the second Gospel by the name of the Apostle Peter, they argue, Justin merely adopted the tradition current in the early Church, and referred to the Gospel now known as the Gospel according to Mark. It must be evident, however, that, after admitting that Justin speaks of the Memoirs "of Peter," it is hasty in the extreme to conclude from the fact that the

[1] Καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν μετωνομακέναι αὐτὸν Πέτρον ἕνα τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ γεγράφθαι ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ γεγενημένον καὶ τοῦτο, μετὰ τοῦ καὶ ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφοὺς υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου ὄντας μετωνομακέναι ὀνόματι τοῦ Βοανεργές, ὅ ἐστιν υἱοὶ βροντῆς, κ.τ.λ. *Dial.* 106.

[2] In the course of explorations in Egypt in 1886 87 the fragment of a Gospel was discovered at Akhmim, the peculiarities of which leave little doubt that it is part of a "Gospel according to Peter," and bears singular analogies to Justin's Memoirs, for it is written in the first person: "I, Simon Peter," etc. The fragment is too short to permit any considerable comparison with Justin's quotations, but some remarkable coincidences exist, and many critics, amongst whom may be mentioned Harnack, Hilgenfeld, J. Rendel Harris, Lods, and Van Manen, consider that this Gospel was used by Justin. For full particulars see *The Gospel According to Peter*, which we separately published 1894 (Longmans, Green, & Co.).

[3] Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii. 15, iii. 39, v. 8, vi. 14, 25; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. I. § 1; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5; Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 1. Cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 375.

mention of the sons of Zebedee being surnamed Boanerges is only recorded in Mark iii. 17, and not in the other canonical Gospels, that, therefore, the *Memoirs of Peter* and our Gospel according to Mark are one and the same. We shall, hereafter, in examining the testimony of Papias, see that the Gospel according to Mark, of which the Bishop of Hierapolis speaks, was not our canonical Mark at all. It would be very singular indeed, on this hypothesis, that Justin should not have quoted a single passage from the only Gospel whose author he names, and the number of times he seems to quote from a Petrine Gospel, which was quite different from Mark, confirms the inference that he cannot possibly here refer to our second Gospel. It is maintained, therefore, by numerous other critics that Justin refers to a Gospel according to Peter or according to the Hebrews, and not to Mark.

We learn from Eusebius that Serapion, who became Bishop of Antioch about A.D. 190, composed a book on the Gospel, called "according to Peter" (περὶ τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου), which he found in circulation in his diocese. At first Serapion had permitted the use of this Gospel, as it evidently was much prized, but he subsequently condemned it as a work favouring Docetic views, and containing many things superadded to the Doctrine of the Saviour.[1] Origen likewise makes mention of the Gospel according to Peter (τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου) as agreeing with the tradition of the Hebrews.[2] But its relationship to the Gospel according to the Hebrews becomes more clear when Theodoret states that the Nazarenes made use of the Gospel according to Peter,[3] for we know by the testimony of the Fathers generally that the Nazarene Gospel was that commonly called the Gospel according to the Hebrews (Εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίους). The same Gospel was in use amongst the Ebionites, and in fact, as almost all critics are agreed, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, under various names, such as the Gospel according to Peter, according to the Apostles, the Nazarenes, Ebionites, Egyptians, &c., with modifications certainly, but substantially the same work, was circulated very widely throughout the early Church.[4] A quotation occurs in the so-called Epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrnæans, to which

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi. 12; cf. Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 41.

[2] Ad. Matt. xiii. 54 56. He couples it with the Book of James, or the *Protevangelium Jacobi*.

[3] *Hæret. Fab.*, ii. 2; cf. Hieron. lib. vi. *Comment. in* Ezech. xviii., in Matt. xii. 13; *De Vir. Ill.*, 2. The Marcosians also used this Gospel, and we have seen them in agreement with Justin's quotation; cf. p. 254 ff.

[4] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 25; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxx. 13; Hieron., *Adv. Pelag.*, iii. 1, ad Matt. vi. 11, xii. 13, xxiii. 35; Theodoret, *Hæret. Fab.*, ii. 2; Ambrose, *Proem. Ev. Lucæ*.

we have already referred, which is said by Origen to be in the work called the Teaching of Peter[1] (Διδαχὴ Πέτρου), but Jerome states that it is taken from the Hebrew Gospel of the Nazarenes.[2] Delitzsch finds traces of the Gospel according to the Hebrews before A.D. 130 in the Talmud.[3] Eusebius[4] informs us that Papias narrated a story regarding a woman accused before the Lord of many sins which was contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews.[5] The same writer likewise states that Hegesippus, who came to Rome and commenced his public career under Anicetus, quoted from the same Gospel.[6] The evidence of this "ancient and apostolic" man is very important, for, although he evidently attaches great value to tradition, does not seem to know of any canonical Scriptures of the New Testament, and, like Justin, apparently rejected the Apostle Paul, he still regarded the Gospel according to the Hebrews with respect, and probably made exclusive use of it. The best critics consider that this Gospel was the evangelical work used by the author of the *Clementine Homilies*. Cerinthus and Carpocrates made use of a form of it,[7] and there is good reason to suppose that Tatian, like his master Justin, used the same Gospel; indeed, his *Diatessaron*, we are told, was by some called the Gospel according to the Hebrews.[8] Clement of Alexandria quotes it as an authority, with quite the same respect as the other Gospels. He says: "So also in the Gospel according to the Hebrews: 'He who wonders shall reign,' it is written, 'and he who reigns shall rest.'"[9] A form of this Gospel, "according to the Egyptians," is quoted in the second Epistle of pseudo-Clement of Rome, as we are informed by the Alexandrian Clement, who likewise quotes the same passage.[10] Origen frequently made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews,[11] and that it long enjoyed great consideration in

[1] *De Princip. Præf.*, § 8.

[2] Hieron., *Proem. in Esaiæ*, xviii., *De Vir. Ill.*, 16; cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 359 f. A similar passage was in the Κήρυγμα Πέτρου, cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 249. Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 407 f.

[3] *Tract. Sabbath. f.* 116; Delitzsch, *N. Unters. Enst. kan. Evv.*, p. 18.

[4] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39.

[5] This is generally believed to be the episode inserted in the fourth Gospel, viii. 1–11, but not originally belonging to it.

[6] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 22.

[7] Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxvii. 5, cf. xxx. 26, xxx. 14. Cf. De Wette, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 116 f., 119; Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i., p. 204.

[8] Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xlvi. 1.

[9] ἢ κἀν τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίῳ "ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει," γέγραπται, "καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαυθήσεται." Clem. Al., *Strom.*, ii. 9, § 45.

[10] 2 *Ep. ad Corinth.*, xii.; cf. Clem. Al., *Strom.*, iii. 9, § 13.

[11] *Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur secundum Hebræos.....quo et Origenes sæpe utitur.* Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 2; Origen, in *Joh.*, vol. iv., 63, Matt. xix. 19, vol. iii., p. 771, etc.

the Church is proved by the fact that Theodoret found it in circulation not only amongst heretics, but also amongst orthodox Christian communities;[1] and even in the fourth century Eusebius records doubts as to the rank of this Gospel amongst Christian books, speaking of it under the second class in which some reckoned the Apocalypse of John.[2] Later still Jerome translated it;[3] whilst Nicephorus inserts it, in his Stichometry, not amongst the Apocrypha, but amongst the Antilegomena, or merely doubtful books of the New Testament, along with the Apocalypse of John. In such repute was this Gospel amongst the earliest Christian communities that it was generally believed to be the original of the Greek Gospel of Matthew. Irenæus states that the Ebionites used solely the Gospel according to Matthew and reject the Apostle Paul, asserting that he was an apostate from the law.[4] We know from statements regarding the Ebionites[5] that this Gospel could not have been our Gospel according to Matthew, and besides both Clement[6] of Alexandria and Origen[7] call it the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Eusebius, however, still more clearly identifies it, as we have seen above. Repeating the statements of Irenæus, he says: "These indeed [the Ebionites] thought that all the Epistles of the Apostle [Paul] should be rejected, calling him an apostate from the law; making use only of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, they took little account of the rest."[8] Epiphanius calls both the Gospel of the Ebionites and of the Nazarenes the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," and also the Gospel according to Matthew,[9] as does also Theodoret.[10] Jerome translated the Gospel according to the Hebrews both into Greek and Latin,[11] and it is clear that his belief was that this Gospel, a copy of which he found in the library collected at Cæsarea by the Martyr Pamphilus (†309), was the Hebrew original of Matthew; and in support of this view he points out that it did not follow the version of the LXX. in its quotations from the Old Testament, but quoted directly from the

[1] *Fab. Hær.*, i. 20; cf. Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xlvi. 1.

[2] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 25. It is very doubtful indeed whether he does not say that some class it amongst the ὁμολογούμενα, whilst himself placing it in the second class. Cf. Guericke, *Gesammtgesch. N. T.*, p. 219: Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i., p. 211, anm. 1.

[3] *De Vir. Ill.*, 2. [4] *Adv. Hær.*, i. 26, § 2; cf. iii. 12, § 7.

[5] Origen, *Contra Cels.*, v. 61; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 27.

[6] *Strom.*, ii. 9, § 45.

[7] In *Joh.* t. ii. 6 (Op. iv., p. 63 f.), *Hom.* in Jerem., xv. 4; cf. Hieron., in Mich. vii. 6; in Es. xl. 12, *De Vir. Ill.*, 2. [8] *H. E.*, iii. 27.

[9] *Hær.*, xxx. 3; cf. *Hær.* xxix. 9, xxx. 14. [10] *Hær. Fab.*, ii. 1.

[11] *Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur secundum Hebræos, et a me nuper in græcum latinumque sermonem translatum est, quo et Origenes sæpe utitur*, etc. Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.* 2; cf. *Adv. Pelag.*, 1.

Hebrew.[1] An attempt has been made to argue that, later, Jerome became doubtful of this view, but it seems to us that this is not the case, and certainly Jerome in his subsequent writings states that it was generally held to be the original of Matthew.[2] That this Gospel was not identical with the Greek Matthew is evident both from the quotations of Jerome and others, and also from the fact that Jerome considered it worth while to translate it twice. If the Greek Gospel had been an accurate translation of it, of course there could not have been inducement to make another. As we shall hereafter see, the belief was universal in the early Church that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. Attempts have been made to argue that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was first written in Greek and then translated into Hebrew, but the reasons advanced seem quite insufficient and arbitrary, and it is contradicted by the whole tradition of the Fathers.

It is not necessary for our purpose to enter fully here into the question of the exact relation of our canonical Gospel according to Matthew to the Gospel according to the Hebrews. It is sufficient for us to point out that we meet with the latter before Matthew's Gospel, and that the general opinion of the early Church was that it was the original of the canonical Gospel. This opinion, as Schwegler[3] remarks, is supported by the fact that tradition assigns the origin of both Gospels to Palestine, and that both were intended for Jewish Christians, and exclusively used by them. That the two works, however originally related, had by subsequent manipulation become distinct, although still amidst much variation preserving some substantial affinity, cannot be doubted; and, in addition to the evidence already cited, we may point out that in the Stichometry of Nicephorus the Gospel according to Matthew is said to have 2,500 στίχοι, whilst that according to the Hebrews has only 2,200.

Whether this Gospel formed one of the writings of the πολλοί of Luke it is not our purpose to inquire; but enough has been

[1] *Porro ipsum hebraicum (Matthæi) habetur usque hodie in Cæsariensi bibliotheca quam Pamphilus martyr studiosissime confecit, mihi quoque a Nazaræis qui in Beroa, urbe Syriæ hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit, in quo animadvertendum, quod ubicunque Evangelista sive ex persona Domini Salvatoris veteris Scripturæ testimoniis utitur, non sequatur LXX translatorum auctoritatem sed hebraicam*, etc. *De Vir. Ill.*, 3.

[2] *In Evangelio juxta Hebræos quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone sed hebraicis literis scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni secundum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant juxta Matthæum quod et in Cæsariensi habetur Bibliotheca, narrat historia*, etc. Hieron., *Adv. Pelag.*, iii. 2; cf. *Comment. in Esaiæ*, xi. 2, ad. Matt. xii. 13.

[3] *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i., p. 241.

said to prove that it was one of the most ancient and most valued evangelical works, and to show the probability that Justin Martyr, a Jewish Christian living amongst those who are known to have made exclusive use of this Gospel, may well, like his contemporary Hegesippus, have used the Gospel according to the Hebrews; and this probability is, as we have seen, greatly strengthened by the fact that many of his quotations agree with passages which we know to have been contained in it; whilst, on the other hand, almost all differ from our Gospels, presenting generally, however, a greater affinity to the Gospel according to Matthew, as we might expect, than to the other two. It is clear that the title "Gospel according to the Hebrews" cannot have been its actual superscription, but merely was a name descriptive of the readers for whom it was prepared, or amongst whom it chiefly circulated, and it is most probable that it originally bore no other title than "The Gospel" (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον), to which were added the different designations under which we find it known amongst different communities.[1] We have already seen that Justin speaks of "The Gospel," and seems to refer to the *Memoirs of Peter*, both distinguishing appellations of this Gospel; but there is another of the names borne by the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," which singularly recalls the *Memoirs of the Apostles*, by which Justin prefers to call his evangelical work. It was called the *Gospel according to the Apostles* (εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους), and, in short, comparing Justin's Memoirs with this Gospel, we find at once similarity of contents, and even of name.[2]

It is not necessary, however, for the purposes of this examination to dwell more fully upon the question as to what specific Gospel, now no longer extant, Justin employed. We have shown that there is no evidence that he made use of any of our Gospels, and he cannot, therefore, be cited even to prove their existence, and much less to attest the authenticity and character of records whose authors he does not once name. On the other hand, it has been made evident that there were other Gospels, now lost, but which then enjoyed the highest consideration, from which his quotations might have been, and probably were, taken. We have seen that Justin's *Memoirs of the Apostles* contained facts of Gospel history unknown to our Gospels, which were contained in apocryphal works, and notably in the Gospel according to the Hebrews;

[1] Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i., p. 202; Baur, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 573.

[2] Schwegler rightly remarks that if it can be shown that Justin even once made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or any other uncanonical source, there is no ground for asserting that he may not always have done so. *Das nachap. Zeit*, i., p. 229 f.; Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 229; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 256 f.

that they further contained matter contradictory to our Gospels, and sayings of Jesus not contained in them; and that his quotations, although so numerous, systematically vary from similar passages in our Gospels. No theory of quotation from memory can satisfactorily account for these phenomena, and the reasonable conclusion is that Justin did not make use of our Gospels, but quoted from another source. In no case can the testimony of Justin afford the requisite support to the Gospels as records of miracles and of a Divine Revelation.

CHAPTER IV.

HEGESIPPUS—PAPIAS OF HIERAPOLIS

We now turn to Hegesippus, one of the contemporaries of Justin, and, like him, a Palestinian Jewish Christian. Most of our information regarding him is derived from Eusebius, who fortunately gives rather copious extracts from his writings. Hegesippus was born in Palestine, of Jewish parents,[1] and in all probability belonged to the primitive community of Jerusalem. In order to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the state of the Church, he travelled widely and came to Rome when Anicetus was Bishop. Subsequently he wrote a work of historical Memoirs, *ὑπομνήματα*, in five books, and thus became the first ecclesiastical historian of Christianity. This work is lost, but portions have been preserved to us by Eusebius, and one other fragment is also extant. It must have been, in part at least, written after the succession of Eleutherus to the Roman bishopric (A.D. 177–193), as that event is mentioned in the book itself, and his testimony is allowed by all critics to date from an advanced period of the second half of the second century.

The testimony of Hegesippus is of great value, not only as that of a man born near the primitive Christian tradition, but also as that of an intelligent traveller amongst many Christian communities. Eusebius evidently held him in high estimation as recording the unerring tradition of the Apostolic preaching in the most simple style of composition,[2] and as a writer of authority who was "contemporary with the first successors of the Apostles"[3] (*ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης τῶν ἀποστόλων γενόμενος διαδοχῆς*). Any indications, therefore, which we may derive from information regarding him, and from the fragments of his writings which survive, must be of peculiar importance for our inquiry.

As might have been expected from a convert from Judaism[4] (*πεπιστευκὼς ἐξ Ἑβραίων*), we find in Hegesippus manifest evidences of general tendency to the Jewish side of Christianity. For him, "James, the brother of the Lord," was the chief of the

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 22.

[2] *τὴν ἀπλανῆ παράδοσιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος ἀπλουστάτῃ συντάξει γραφῆς ὑπομνηματισάμενος, κ.τ.λ.* Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 8.

[3] Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii. 23; cf. Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 22.

[4] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 22.

Apostles, and he states that he had received the government of the Church after the death of Jesus.[1] The account which he gives of him is remarkable. "He was holy from his mother's womb. He drank neither wine nor strong drink, nor ate he any living thing. A razor never went upon his head, he anointed not himself with oil, and did not use a bath. He alone was allowed to enter into the Holies. For he did not wear woollen garments, but linen. And he alone entered into the Sanctuary, and was wont to be found upon his knees seeking forgiveness on behalf of the people; so that his knees became hard like a camel's, through his constant kneeling in supplication to God, and asking for forgiveness for the people. In consequence of his exceeding great righteousness he was called Righteous and 'Oblias,' that is, Protector of the people and Righteousness, as the prophets declare concerning him,"[2] and so on. Throughout the whole of his account of James, Hegesippus describes him as a mere Jew, and as frequenting the temple, and even entering the Holy of Holies as a Jewish High Priest. Whether the account be apocryphal or not is of little consequence here; it is clear that Hegesippus sees no incongruity in it, and that the difference between the Jew and the Christian was extremely small. The head of the Christian community could assume all the duties of the Jewish High Priest,[3] and his Christian doctrines did not offend more than a small party amongst the Jews.

We are not, therefore, surprised to find that his rule (*κανών*) of orthodoxy in the Christian communities which he visited was "the Law, the Prophets, and the Lord." Speaking of the result of his observations during his travels, and of the succession of Bishops in Rome, he says: "The Corinthian Church has continued in the true faith until Primus, now Bishop of Corinth. I conversed with him on my voyage to Rome, and stayed many days with the Corinthians, during which time we were refreshed together with true doctrine. Arrived in Rome, I composed the succession until Anicetus, whose deacon was Eleutherus. After Anicetus succeeded Soter, and afterwards Eleutherus. But with every succession, and in every city, that prevails which the Law, and the Prophets, and the Lord enjoin."[4] The test of true doctrine (*ὀρθὸς λόγος*) with Hegesippus, as with Justin, therefore, is no New Testament Canon, which does not yet exist for him, but the Old Testament, the only Holy Scriptures which he acknowledges, and the words of the Lord himself, which, as in the case of

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii. 23. [2] Euseb., *H. E.*, ii. 23.

[3] Epiphanius also has the tradition that James alone, as High Priest, once a year went into the Holy of Holies. *Hær.*, lxxviii. 13; cf. 14; xxix. 4.

[4] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 22.

Jewish Christians like Justin, were held to be established by, and in direct conformity with, the Old Testament. He carefully transmits the unerring tradition of apostolic preaching (*τὴν ἀπλανῆ παράδοσιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος*), but he apparently knows nothing of any canonical series even of apostolic epistles.

The care with which Eusebius searches for information regarding the books of the New Testament in early writers, and his anxiety to produce any evidence concerning their composition and authenticity, render his silence upon the subject almost as important as his distinct utterance when speaking of such a man as Hegesippus. Now, while Eusebius does not mention that Hegesippus refers to any of our canonical Gospels or Epistles, he very distinctly states that he made use in his writings of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" (*ἔκ τε τοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίου.....τινὰ τίθησιν*). It may be well, however, to give his remarks in a consecutive form. "He sets forth some matters from the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Syriac, and particularly from the Hebrew language, showing that he was a convert from among the Hebrews, and other things he records as from unwritten Jewish tradition. And not only he, but also Irenæus, and the whole body of the ancients, called the Proverbs of Solomon: all-virtuous Wisdom. And regarding the so-called Apocrypha, he states that some of them had been forged in his own time by certain heretics."[1]

It is clear that Eusebius, who quotes with so much care the testimony of Papias, a man of whom he speaks disparagingly, regarding the composition of the first two Gospels, would not have neglected to have availed himself of the evidence of Hegesippus, for whom he has so much respect, had that writer furnished him with any opportunity, and there can be no doubt that he found no facts concerning the origin and authorship of our Gospels in his writings. It is, on the other hand, reasonable to infer that Hegesippus exclusively made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, together with unwritten tradition. In the passage regarding the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as even Lardner[2] conjectures, the text of Eusebius is in all probability confused, and he doubtless said what Jerome later found to be the fact, that "the Gospel according to the Hebrews is written in the Chaldaic and Syriac (or Syro-Chaldaic) language, but with Hebrew characters."[3] It is in this sense that Rufinus translates it. It

[1] *H. E.*, iv. 22.

[2] *Credibility*, etc., Works, ii., p. 144.

[3] *In Evangelio juxta Hebræos quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone sed hebraïcis literis scriptum est*, etc. *Adv. Pelag.*, iii. 1.

may not be inappropriate to point out that fragments of the Gospel according to the Hebrews which have been preserved show the same tendency to give some pre-eminence to James amongst the Apostles which we observe in Hegesippus.[1] It has been argued by a few that the words, "and regarding the so-called Apocrypha, he states that some of them had been forged in his own times by certain heretics," are contradictory to his attributing authority to the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or at least that they indicate some distinction amongst Christians between recognised and apocryphal works. The apocryphal works referred to, however, are clearly Old Testament Apocrypha.[2] The words are introduced by the statement that Hegesippus records matters "as from unwritten Jewish tradition," and then proceeds, "and not only he, but also Irenæus and the whole body of the ancients, called the Proverbs of Solomon: all-virtuous wisdom." Then follow the words, "And with regard to the *so-called* Apocrypha," etc., evidently passing from the work just mentioned to the Old Testament Apocrypha, several of which stand also in the name of Solomon, and it is not improbable that amongst these were included the *Ascensio Esaiæ* and the *Apocalypsis Eliæ*, to which is referred a passage which Hegesippus, in a fragment preserved by Photius,[3] strongly repudiates. As Hegesippus does not, so far as we know, mention any canonical work of the New Testament, but takes as his rule of faith the Law, the Prophets, and the words of the Lord, probably as he finds them in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, quotes also Jewish tradition and discusses the Proverbs of Solomon, the only possible conclusion at which we can reasonably arrive is that he spoke of Old Testament Apocrypha. There cannot be a doubt that Eusebius would have recorded his repudiation of New Testament "Apocrypha," regarding which he so carefully collects information, and his consequent recognition of New Testament canonical works implied in such a distinction.

We must now see how far in the fragments of the works of Hegesippus which have been preserved to us there are references to assist our inquiry. In his account of certain surviving members of the family of Jesus who were brought before Domitian, Hegesippus says: "For Domitian feared the appearing of the Christ as much as Herod."[4] It has been argued that this may be an allusion to the massacre of the children by Herod related in

[1] Cf. Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 2.

[2] Even Dr. Westcott admits: "There is indeed nothing to show distinctly that he refers to the apocryphal books of the New Testament, but there is nothing to limit his words to the Old" (*On the Canon*, p. 184).

[3] *Bibl.*, 232; cf. Routh, *Relig. Sacræ*, 1846, i., p. 281 f.

[4] ἐφοβεῖτο γὰρ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς καὶ Ἡρῴδης. Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 20.

Matt. ii., more especially as it is doubtful whether the parallel account to that contained in the first two chapters of the first Gospel existed in the oldest forms of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.[1] But the tradition which has been preserved in our first Synoptic may have formed part of many other evangelical works, in one shape or another, and certainly cannot be claimed with reason exclusively for that Gospel. This argument, therefore, has no weight, and it obviously rests upon the vaguest conjecture.

The principal passages which apologists[2] adduce as references to our Gospels occur in the account which Hegesippus gives of the martyrdom of James the Just. The first of these is the reply which James is said to have made to the Scribes and Pharisees: "Why do ye ask me concerning Jesus the Son of Man? He sits in heaven on the right hand of great power, and is about to come on the clouds of heaven."[3] This is compared with Matt. xxvi. 64: "From this time ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven."[4] It is not necessary to point out the variations between these two passages, which are obvious. If we had not the direct intimation that Hegesippus made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which no doubt contained this passage, it would be apparent that a man who valued tradition so highly might well have derived it from that source. This is precisely one of those sayings which were most current in the early Church, whose hope and courage were sustained amid persecution and suffering by such Chiliastic expectations, with which, according to the apostolic injunction, they comforted each other.[5] In any case, the words do not agree with the passage in the first Gospel; and with such discrepancy, without any evidence that Hegesippus knew anything of our Gospels, but, on the contrary, with the knowledge that he made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, we must decide that any such quotations must rather be derived from it than from our Gospels.

It is scarcely necessary to say anything regarding the phrase, "for we and all the people testify to thee that thou art just, and that thou respectest not persons."[6] Dr. Westcott points out

[1] Cf. Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxix. 9; Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 8, *Comm. ad Matt.* ii. 6, xii. 13, *ad Es.* xi. 1; *ad Habac.*, iii. 3.

[2] Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 182, note 4.

[3] Τί με ἐπερωτᾶτε περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; καὶ αὐτὸς κάθηται ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς μεγάλης δυνάμεως, καὶ μέλλει ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Euseb., *H. E.*, ii. 23.

[4] ἀπ' ἄρτι ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Matt. xxvi. 64.

[5] 1 Thess. iv. 18.

[6] Euseb., *H. E.*, ii 23.

that *καὶ οὐ λαμβάνεις πρόσωπον* only occurs in Luke xx. 21, and Galatians ii. 6;[1] but the similarity of this single phrase, which is not given as a quotation, but in a historical form put into the mouth of those who are addressing James, cannot be accepted as evidence of a knowledge of Luke. The episode of the tribute money is generally ascribed to the oldest form of the Gospel history, and, although the other two Synoptics[2] read *βλέπεις εἰς* for *λαμβάνεις*, there is no ground for asserting that some of the *πολλοί* who preceded Luke did not use the latter form, and as little for asserting that it did not so stand, for instance, in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The employment of the same expression in the Epistle, moreover, at once deprives the Gospel of any individuality in its use.

Hegesippus represents the dying James as kneeling down and praying for those who were stoning him: "I beseech (thee), Lord God Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" (*Παρακαλῶ, κύριε Θεὲ πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασι τί ποιοῦσιν*).[3] This is compared with the prayer which Luke[4] puts into the mouth of Jesus on the cross: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" (*Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν*), and it is assumed from this partial coincidence that Hegesippus was acquainted with the third of our canonical Gospels. We are surprised to see an able and accomplished critic like Hilgenfeld adopting such a conclusion without either examination or argument of any kind.[5] Such a deduction is totally unwarranted by the facts of the case, and if the partial agreement of a passage in such a Father with a historical expression in a Gospel which, alone out of many previously existent, has come down to us can be considered evidence of the acquaintance of the Father with that particular Gospel, the function of criticism is at an end.

It may here be observed that the above passage of Luke xxiii. 34 is omitted altogether from the Vatican MS. and *Codex D* (Bezæ), and in the *Codex Sinaiticus* its position is of a very doubtful character.[6] The Codex Alexandrinus which contains it

[1] *On the Canon*, p. 182, note 4.
[2] Matt. xxii. 16; Mark xii. 14.
[3] Euseb., *H. E.*, ii. 23.
[4] xxiii. 34.
[5] *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1863, p. 354, p. 360, anm. 1; *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 369; *Der Kanon*, p. 28. In each of these places the bare assertion is made, and the reader is referred to the other passages. In fact, there is merely a circle of references to mere unargued assumptions. Bunsen (*Bibelwerk*, viii., p. 543) repeats the assertion of Hilgenfeld, and refers to the passages above, where, however, as we have stated, no attempt whatever is made to establish the truth of the assumption. Cf. Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 19; *Het Paulin. Evangelie*, p. 3.
[6] The passage is put within brackets by Lachmann, and within double brackets by Westcott and Hort.

omits the word πάτερ.[1] Luke's Gospel was avowedly composed after many other similar works were already in existence, and we know from our Synoptics how closely such writings often followed each other, and drew from the same sources.[2] If any historical character is conceded to this prayer of Jesus, it is natural to suppose that it must have been given in at least some of these numerous Gospels which have unfortunately perished. No one could reasonably assert that our third Gospel is the only one which ever contained the passage. It would be unwarrantable to affirm, for instance, that it did not exist in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which Hegesippus employed. On the supposition that the passage is historical, which apologists at least will not dispute, what could be more natural or probable than that such a prayer, "emanating from the innermost soul of Jesus,"[3] should have been adopted under similar circumstances by James his brother and successor, who certainly could not have derived it from Luke. The tradition of such words, expressing so much of the original spirit of Christianity, setting aside for the moment written Gospels, could scarcely fail to have remained fresh in the mind of the early Church, and more especially in the primitive community among whom they were uttered, and of which Hegesippus was himself a later member; and they would certainly have been treasured by one who was so careful a collector and transmitter of "the unerring tradition of the apostolic preaching." No saying is more likely to have been preserved by tradition, both from its own character, brevity, and origin, and from the circumstances under which it was uttered, and there can be no reason for limiting it amongst written records to Luke's Gospel. The omission of the prayer from very important codices of Luke further weakens the claim of that Gospel to the passage. Beyond these general considerations, however, there is the important and undoubted fact that the prayer which Hegesippus represents James as uttering does not actually agree with the prayer of Jesus in the third Gospel. So far from proving the use of Luke, therefore, this merely fragmentary and partial agreement, on the contrary, rather proves that he did not know that Gospel, for on the supposition of his making use of the third Synoptic at all for such a purpose, and not simply giving the prayer which James may in reality have uttered, why did he not quote the prayer as he actually found it in Luke?

[1] The *Clementine Homilies* give the prayer of Jesus: Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν, κ.τ.λ. *Hom.*, xi. 20.

[2] The passage we are considering was certainly not an original addition by the author of our present third gospel, but was derived from earlier sources. Cf. Ewald, *Die drei ersten Evv.*, p. 150.

[3] "*Ganz aus dem innersten Geiste Jesus' geschöpft.*" Ewald, *Die drei erst. Evv.*, p. 361.

We have still to consider a fragment of Hegesippus preserved to us by Stephanus Gobarus, a learned monophysite of the sixth century, which reads as follows: "That the good things prepared for the righteous neither eye saw, nor ear heard, nor entered they into the heart of man. Hegesippus, however, an ancient and apostolic man, how moved I know not, says in the fifth book of his Memoirs that these words are vainly spoken, and that those who say these things give the lie to the divine writings and to the Lord, saying: 'Blessed are your eyes that see, and your ears that hear,'" etc. (*Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν οἱ βλέποντες, καὶ τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν τὰ ἀκούοντα, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς*).[1] We believe that we have here an expression of the strong prejudice against the Apostle Paul and his teaching, which continued for so long to prevail amongst Jewish Christians, and which is apparent in many writings of that period. The quotation of Paul, 1 Cor. ii. 9, differs materially from the Septuagint version of the passage in Isaiah lxiv. 4, and, as we have seen, the same passage quoted by Clement of Rome,[2] differs both from the version of the LXX. and from the epistle, although closer to the former. Jerome, however, found the passage in the apocryphal work called *Ascensio Esaiæ*,[3] and Origen, Jerome, and others, likewise ascribe it to the *Apocalypsis Eliæ*.[4] This, however, does not concern us here, and we have merely to examine the "saying of the Lord," which Hegesippus opposes to the passage: "Blessed are your eyes that see and your ears that hear." This is compared with Matt. xiii. 16, "But blessed are your eyes, for they see, and your ears, for they hear" (*ὑμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὅτι βλέπουσιν, καὶ τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν ὅτι ἀκούουσιν*), and also with Luke x. 23, "Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see," etc. We need not point out that the saying referred to by Hegesippus, whilst conveying the same sense as that in the two Gospels, differs from them both as they do from each other, and as we might expect a quotation taken from a different though kindred source, like the Gospel according to the Hebrews, to do. The whole of the passages which we have examined, indeed, exhibit the same natural variation.

We have already referred to the expressions of Hegesippus regarding the heresies in the early Church: "From these sprang the false Christs, and false prophets, and *false apostles*, who divided the unity of the Church by corrupting doctrines concerning God and his Christ."[5] We have shown how this recalls quotations in Justin of sayings of Jesus foreign to our Gospels, in common with similar expressions in the *Clementine Homilies*,[6] *Apostolic*

[1] Photius, *Bibl. Cod.*, 232, col. 893.
[2] *Ep. ad Corinth.* xxxiv.
[3] *Comm. Es.*, lxiv. 4.
[4] Cf. Cotelerius, *Patr. Apost.*, *in notis ad. Constit. Apost.*, vi. 16.
[5] Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 22.
[6] xvi. 21.

Constitutions,[1] and *Clementine Recognitions*,[2] and we need not discuss the matter further. This community of reference, in a circle known to have made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, to matters foreign to our Synoptics, furnishes collateral illustration of the influence of that Gospel.

Tischendorf, who so eagerly searches for every trace, real or imaginary, of the use of our Gospels and of the existence of a New Testament Canon, passes over in silence, with the exception of a short note[3] devoted to the denial that Hegesippus was opposed to Paul, this first writer of Christian Church history, whose evidence, could it have been adduced, would have been so valuable. He does not pretend that Hegesippus made use of the canonical Gospels, or knew of any other Holy Scriptures than those of the Old Testament; but, on the other hand, he does not mention that he possessed, and quoted from, the Gospel according to the Hebrews. There is no reason for supposing that Hegesippus found a New Testament Canon in any of the Christian communities which he visited, and such a rule of faith certainly did not yet exist in Rome in A.D. 160–170. There is no evidence to show that Hegesippus recognised any other evangelical work than the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as the written source of his knowledge of the words of the Lord.

The testimony of Papias is of great interest and importance in connection with our inquiry, inasmuch as he is the first ecclesiastical writer who mentions the tradition that Matthew and Mark composed written records of the life and teaching of Jesus; but no question has been more continuously contested than that of the identity of the works to which he refers with our actual canonical Gospels. Papias was Bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia,[4] in the first half of the second century, and is said to have suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius about A.D. 164–167.[5] About the middle of the second century he wrote a work in five books, entitled "Exposition of the Lord's Oracles"[6] (Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις), which, with the exception of a few fragments preserved to us chiefly by Eusebius and Irenæus, is, unfortunately, no longer extant. In the preface to his book he stated: "But I shall not hesitate also to set beside my interpretations all that I rightly learnt from the Presbyters, and rightly remembered, earnestly testifying to their truth; for I was not, like the multitude, taking pleasure in those who speak much, but in those who teach

[1] vi. 18; cf. 18. [2] iv. 34.
[3] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 19.
[4] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 36, 39; Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 18.
[5] *Chron. Pasch.*, i. 481. [6] Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39.

the truth; nor in those who relate alien commandments, but in those who record those delivered by the Lord to the faith, and which come from the truth itself. If it happened that anyone came who had followed the Presbyters, I inquired minutely after the words of the Presbyters, what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew, or what any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what Aristion and the Presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, say; for I held that what was to be derived from books did not so profit me as that from the living and abiding voice"[1] (Οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτόν με ὠφελεῖν ὑπελάμβανον, ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης). It is clear from this that Papias preferred tradition to any written works with which he was acquainted, that he attached little or no value to any Gospels with which he had met,[2] and that he knew nothing of canonical Scriptures of the New Testament. His work was evidently intended to furnish a collection of the discourses of Jesus completed from oral tradition, with his own expositions; and this is plainly indicated, both by his own words and by the statements of Eusebius, who, amongst other things, mentions that Papias sets forth strange parables of the Saviour, and teachings of his from unwritten tradition (ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀγράφου).[3] It is not, however, necessary to discuss more closely the nature of the work, for there is no doubt that written collections of discourses of Jesus existed before it was composed, of which it is probable he made use.

The most interesting part of the work of Papias which is preserved to us is that relating to Matthew and Mark. After stating that Papias had inserted in his book accounts of Jesus given by Aristion, of whom nothing is known, and by the Presbyter John, Eusebius proceeds to extract a tradition regarding Mark communicated by the latter. There has been much controversy as to the identity of the Presbyter John, some affirming him to have been

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39.

[2] With reference to the last sentence of Papias, Tischendorf asks: "What books does he refer to here, perhaps our Gospels? According to the expression this is not impossible, but from the whole character of the book in the highest degree improbable" (*Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 109). We know little or nothing of the "whole character" of the book, and what we do know is contradictory to our Gospels. The natural and only reasonable course is to believe the express declaration of Papias, more especially as it is made, in this instance, as a prefatory statement of his belief.

[3] *H. E.*, iii. 39. Bleek (*Einl. N. T.*, 1866, p. 94), Credner (*Beiträge*, i., p. 23 f.; *Gesch. N. T. Kan.*, p. 27 f.), and others, consider that Papias used oral tradition solely or mainly in his work. Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr. w. Theol.*, 1875, p. 238 f.; *Einl. N. T.*, 1875, p. 53 ff.) and others suppose that the Hebrew Λόγια of Matthew were the basis of his Exposition, together with tradition, but that he did not use any of our Gospels.

the Apostle, but the great majority of critics deciding that he was a totally different person. Irenæus, who, sharing the Chiliastic opinions of Papias, held him in high respect, boldly calls him "the hearer of John" (meaning the Apostle) "and a companion of Polycarp" (ὁ Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστὴς, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονὼς);[1] but this is expressly contradicted by Eusebius, who points out that, in the preface to his book, Papias by no means asserts that he was himself a hearer of the Apostles, but merely that he received their doctrines from those who had personally known them;[2] and, after making the quotation from Papias which we have given above, he goes on to point out that the name of John is twice mentioned once together with Peter, James, and Matthew and the other Apostles, "evidently the Evangelist," and the other John he mentions separately, ranking him amongst those who are not Apostles, and placing Aristion before him, distinguishing him clearly by the name of Presbyter.[3] He further refers to the statement of the great Bishop of Alexandria, Dionysius,[4] that at Ephesus there were two tombs, each bearing the name of John, thereby leading to the inference that there were two men of the name.[5] There can be no doubt that Papias himself, in the passage quoted, mentions two persons of the name of John, distinguishing the one from the other, and classing the one amongst the Apostles and the other after Aristion, an unknown "disciple of the Lord," and, but for the phrase of Irenæus, so characteristically uncritical and assumptive, there probably never would have been any doubt raised as to the meaning of the passage. The question is not of importance to us, and we may leave it with the remark that a writer who suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius, c. A.D. 165, can scarcely have been a hearer of the Apostles.[6]

The account which the Presbyter John is said to have given of Mark's Gospel is as follows: "'This also the Presbyter said: Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately whatever he remembered, though he did not arrange in order the

[1] *Adv. Hær.*, v. 33, § 4. [2] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39.
[3] Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39. Cf. Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 18.
[4] *Ib.*, *H. E.*, vii. *Proem.*
[5] *Ib.*, vii. 25. Cf. Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 9.
[6] Ewald, *Gesch. Volkes Isr.*, vii., p. 226, anm. 1; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 105. Dr. Lightfoot argues that the *Chronicon Paschale*, from which this date is derived, has inserted the name of Papias in mistake for Papylus, which stands in the *History of Eusebius* (iv. 15), from which, he contends, the author of the *Chronicle* derived his information. He, therefore, concludes that the above date may henceforth be dismissed, and at once proceeds in a singularly arbitrary manner to fix dates for the career of Papias which he considers more acceptable. The matter does not require elaborate argument here. Cf. Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.*, 1875, p. 381 ff

things which were either said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord, nor followed him; but afterwards, as I said,[1] accompanied Peter, who adapted his teaching to the occasion, and not as making a consecutive record of the Lord's oracles. Mark, therefore, committed no error in thus writing down some things as he remembered them. For of one point he was careful, to omit none of the things which he heard, and not to narrate any of them falsely.' These facts Papias relates concerning Mark."[2] The question to decide is, whether the work here described is our canonical Gospel or not.

The first point in this account is the statement that Mark was the interpreter of Peter (*ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου*). Was he merely the secretary of the Apostle, writing in a manner from his dictation, or does the passage mean that he translated the Aramaic narrative of Peter into Greek? The former is the more probable supposition, and that which is most generally adopted; but the question is not material here. The connection of Peter with the Gospel according to Mark was generally affirmed in the early Church, as was also that of Paul with the third Gospel,[3] with the evident purpose of claiming apostolic origin for all the canonical Gospels.[4] Irenæus says: "After their (Peter and Paul) decease, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing that which had been preached by Peter."[5] Eusebius quotes a similar tradition from Clement of Alexandria, embellished, however, with further particulars. He says: "……The cause for which the Gospel according to Mark was written was this: When Peter had

[1] Dr. Lightfoot (*Contemp. Rev.*, 1875, p. 842), in the course of a highly fanciful argument, says, in reference to this "as I said": "It is quite clear that Papias had already said something of the relations existing between St. Peter and St. Mark previously to the extract which gives an account of the Second Gospel, for he there refers back to a preceding notice." It is quite clear that he refers back, but only to the preceding sentence, in which he "had already said something of the relations" in stating the fact that "Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote, etc."

[2] "Καὶ τοῦθ' ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε. Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενομένος ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα. Οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ Κυρίου, οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ· ὕστερον δέ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρῳ, ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων, ὥστε οὐδὲν ἥμαρτε Μάρκος, οὕτως ἐνία γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν. Ἑνὸς γὰρ ἐποιήσατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν, ἢ ψεύσασθαί τι ἐν αὐτοῖς." Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἱστόρηται τῷ Παπίᾳ περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου. Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39.

[3] Irenæus, *Adv. Haer.*, iii. 1; cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 8; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5; Origen, *ap.* Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 25; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 4; Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 7.

[4] Cf. Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5.

[5] Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον, Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδίδωκε. *Adv. Haer.*, iii. 1, § 1; Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 8.

publicly preached the word at Rome, and proclaimed the Gospel by the Spirit, those who were present, being many, requested Mark, as he had followed him from afar, and remembered what he had said, to write down what he had spoken; and, when he had composed the Gospel, he gave it to those who had asked it of him; which, when Peter knew, he neither absolutely hindered nor encouraged it."[1] Tertullian repeats the same tradition. He says: "And the Gospel which Mark published may be affirmed to be Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was.....for it may rightly appear that works which disciples publish are of their masters."[2] We have it again from Origen: "The second (Gospel) is according to Mark, written as Peter directed him."[3] Eusebius gives a more detailed and advanced version of the same tradition. "So much, however, did the effulgence of piety illuminate the minds of those (Romans) who heard Peter that it did not content them to hear but once, nor to receive only the unwritten doctrine of the divine teaching; but, with reiterated entreaties, they besought Mark, to whom the Gospel is ascribed, as the companion of Peter, that he should leave them a written record of the doctrine thus orally conveyed. Nor did they cease their entreaties until they had persuaded the man, and thus became the cause of the writing of the Gospel called according to Mark. They say, moreover, that the Apostle (Peter), having become aware, through revelation to him of the Spirit, of what had been done, was delighted with the ardour of the men, and ratified the work, in order that it might be read in the churches. This narrative is given by Clement in the sixth book of his *Institutions*, whose testimony is supported by that of Papias, the Bishop of Hierapolis."[4] The account given by Clement, however, by no means contained these details, as we have seen. In his *Demonstration of the Gospel*, Eusebius, referring to the same tradition, affirms that it was the modesty of Peter which prevented his writing a Gospel himself.[5] Jerome almost repeats the preceding account of Eusebius: "Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, being entreated by the brethren of Rome, wrote a short Gospel according to what he had

[1] Τὸ δὲ κατὰ Μάρκον ταύτην ἐσχηκέναι τὴν οἰκονομίαν. Τοῦ Πέτρου δημοσίᾳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ κηρύξαντος τὸν λόγον, καὶ Πνεύματι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐξειπόντος, τοὺς παρόντας πολλοὺς ὄντας παρακαλέσαι τὸν Μάρκον, ὡς ἂν ἀκολουθήσαντα αὐτῷ πόρρωθεν καὶ μεμνημένον τῶν λεχθέντων, ἀναγράψαι τὰ εἰρημένα· ποιήσαντα δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, μεταδοῦναι τοῖς δεομένοις αὐτοῦ. Ὅπερ ἐπιγνόντα τὸν Πέτρον, προτρεπτικῶς μήτε κωλῦσαι μήτε προτρέψασθαι. Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 14.

[2] *Licet et Marcus quod edidit Petri affirmetur, cujus interpres Marcus .....Capit majistrorum videri, quæ discipuli promulgarint. Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5.

[3] δεύτερον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον, ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ, ποιήσαντα. Comment. in Matt. Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 25.

[4] Euseb., *H. E.*, ii. 15.

[5] *Demonstr. Evang.*, iii. 5.

received from Peter, which, when Peter heard, he approved, and gave his authority for its being read in the churches, as Clement writes in the sixth book of his *Institutions*,"[1] etc. Jerome, moreover, says that Peter had Mark for an interpreter, "whose Gospel was composed: Peter narrating and he writing" (*cujus evangelium Petro narrante et illo scribente compositum est*).[2] It is evident that all these writers merely repeat with variations the tradition regarding the first two Gospels which Papias originated. Irenæus dates the writing of Mark after the death of Peter and Paul in Rome. Clement describes Mark as writing during Peter's life, the Apostle preserving absolute neutrality. By the time of Eusebius, however, the tradition has acquired new and miraculous elements, and a more decided character; Peter is made aware of the undertaking of Mark through a revelation of the Spirit, and, instead of being neutral, is delighted, and lends the work the weight of his authority. Eusebius refers to Clement and Papias as giving the same account, which they do not, however, and Jerome merely repeats the story of Eusebius without naming him; and the tradition which he had embellished thus becomes endorsed and perpetuated. Such is the growth of tradition;[3] it is impossible to overlook the mythical character of the information we possess as to the origin of the second canonical Gospel.

In a Gospel so completely inspired by Peter as the tradition of Papias and of the early Church indicates we may reasonably expect to find unmistakeable traces of Petrine influence; but, on examination, it will be seen that these are totally wanting. Some of the early Church did not fail to remark this singular discrepancy between the Gospel and the tradition of its dependence on Peter, and, in reply, Eusebius adopts an apologetic tone.[4] For instance, in the brief account of the calling of Simon in Mark, the distinguishing addition, "called Peter," of the first Gospel is omitted,[5] and, still more notably, the whole narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes which gives the event such prominence in the third Gospel.[6] In Matthew, Jesus goes into the house of "Peter" to cure his wife's mother of a fever, whilst in Mark it is "into the

[1] *De Vir. Ill.*, 8. [2] *Ad Hedib.*, c. 2.

[3] A similar discrepancy of tradition is to be observed as to the place in which the Gospel was written, Irenæus and others dating it from Rome, and others (as Chrysostom, in *Matt. Homil.*, i.) assigning it to Egypt. Indeed, some MSS. of the second Gospel have the words ἐγράφη ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ in accordance with this tradition as to its origin. Cf. Scholz, *Einl. N. T.*, i., p. 201. Various critics have argued for its composition at Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. We do not go into the discussion as to whether Peter ever was in Rome.

[4] *Dem. Ev.*, iii. 3.

[5] Cf. Mark i. 16, 17; Matt. iv. 18. [6] Luke v. 1–11.

house of Simon and Andrew," the less honourable name being still continued.[1] Matthew commences the catalogue of the twelve by the pointed indication : "The first, Simon, who is called Peter,"[2] thus giving him precedence, whilst Mark merely says, "And Simon he surnamed Peter."[3] The important episode of Peter's walking on the sea, of the first Gospel,[4] is altogether ignored by Mark. The enthusiastic declaration of Peter, "Thou art the Christ,"[5] is only followed by the chilling injunction to tell no one, in the second Gospel,[6] whilst Matthew not only gives greater prominence to the declaration of Peter, but gives the reply of Jesus, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona," &c.—of which Mark apparently knows nothing—and then proceeds to the most important episode in the history of the Apostle, the celebrated words by which the surname of Peter was conferred upon him : "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church," etc.[7] The Gospel supposed to have been inspired by Peter, however, totally omits this most important passage, as it also does the miracle of the finding the tribute money in the fish's mouth, narrated by the first Gospel.[8] Luke states that "Peter and John" are sent to prepare the Passover, whilst Mark has only "two disciples";[9] and in the account of the last Supper, Luke gives the address of Jesus to Peter : "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you (all) that he may sift you as wheat ; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not ; and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."[10] Of this Mark does not say a word. Again, after the denial, Luke reads : "And the Lord turned and looked upon Peter, and Peter remembered the word of the Lord, etc., and Peter went out and wept bitterly";[11] whereas Mark omits the reproachful look of Jesus, and makes the penitence of Peter depend merely on the second crowing of the cock, and further modifies the penitence by the omission of "bitterly"—"And when he thought thereon, he wept."[12] There are other instances to which we need not refer. Not only are some of the most important episodes in which Peter is represented by the other Gospels as a principal actor altogether omitted, but throughout the Gospel there is a total absence of anything which is specially characteristic of Petrine influence and teaching. The argument that these omissions are due to the modesty of Peter is quite untenable, for not only does Irenæus, the most ancient authority

[1] Mark i. 29.
[2] Matt. x. 2.
[3] Mark iii. 16.
[4] Matt. xiv. 22–33.
[5] Matt. adds, "the son of the living God," xvi. 16.
[6] Mark viii. 27–30 ; cf. Baur, *Das Markus Ev.*, p. 133.
[7] Matt. xvi. 16–19.
[8] Matt. xvii. 24–27.
[9] Luke xxii. 8 ; Mark xiv. 13.
[10] Luke xxii. 31, 32.
[11] *Ib.*, 61, 62 ; cf. Matt. xxvi. 75.
[12] Mark xiv. 27.

on the point, state that this Gospel was only written after the death of Peter,[1] but also there is no modesty in omitting passages of importance in the history of Jesus, simply because Peter himself was in some way concerned in them, or, for instance, in decreasing his penitence for such a denial of his master, which could not but have filled a sad place in the Apostle's memory. On the other hand, there is no adequate record of special matter, which the intimate knowledge of the doings and sayings of Jesus possessed by Peter might have supplied, to counterbalance the singular omissions. There is much more of the spirit of Peter in the first Gospel than there is in the second. The whole internal evidence, therefore, shows that this part of the tradition of the Presbyter John transmitted by Papias does not apply to our Gospel.

The discrepancy is still more marked when we compare with our actual second Gospel the account of the work of Mark which Papias received from the Presbyter. Mark wrote down from memory some parts (ἕνια) of the teaching of Peter regarding the life of Jesus, but as Peter adapted his instructions to the actual circumstances (πρὸς τὰς χρείας), and did not give a consecutive report (σύνταξις) of the sayings or doings of Jesus, Mark was only careful to be accurate, and did not trouble himself to arrange in historical order (τάξις) his narrative of the things which were said and done by Jesus, but merely wrote down facts as he remembered them. This description would lead us to expect a work composed of fragmentary reminiscences of the teaching of Peter, without regular sequence or connection. The absence of orderly arrangement is the most prominent feature in the description, and forms the burden of the whole. Mark writes "what he remembered"; "he did not arrange in order the things that were either said or done by Christ." And then follow the apologetic expressions of explanation—he was not himself a hearer or follower of the Lord, but derived his information from the occasional preaching of Peter, who did not attempt to give a consecutive narrative. Now, it is impossible in the work of Mark, here described, to recognise our present second Gospel, which does not depart in any important degree from the order of the other two Synoptics, and which throughout has the most evident character of orderly arrangement. Each of the Synoptics compared with the other two would present a similar degree of variation, but none of them could justly be described as not arranged in order, or as not being consecutive. The second Gospel opens formally, and, after presenting John the Baptist as the messenger sent to prepare the way of the Lord, proceeds to

[1] *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 1, § 1; Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 8. See quot., p. 279, note 5.

the baptism of Jesus, his temptation, his entry upon public life, and his calling of the disciples. Then, after a consecutive narrative of his teaching and works, the history ends with a full account of the last events in the life of Jesus, his trial, crucifixion, and resurrection. There is in the Gospel every characteristic of artistic and orderly arrangement, from the striking introduction by the prophetic voice crying in the wilderness to the solemn close of the marvellous history.[1] The great majority of critics, therefore, are agreed in concluding that the account of the Presbyter John recorded by Papias does not apply to our second canonical Gospel at all. Many of those who affirm that the description of Papias may apply to our second Gospel do so with hesitation, and few maintain that we now possess the original work without considerable subsequent alteration. Some of these critics, however, feeling the difficulty of identifying our second Gospel with the work here described, endeavour to reconcile the discrepancy by a fanciful interpretation of the account of Papias. They suggest that the first part, in which the want of chronological order is pointed out, refers to the rough notes which Mark made during the actual preaching and lifetime of Peter, and that the latter part applies to our present Gospel, which he later remodelled into its present shape. This most unreasonable and arbitrary application of the words of Papias is denounced even by apologists.

It has been well argued that the work here described as produced by Mark in the character of ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου is much more one of the same family as the *Clementine Homilies* than of our Gospels. The work was no systematic narrative of the history of Jesus, nor report of his teaching, but the dogmatic preaching of the Apostle, illustrated and interspersed with passages from the discourses of Jesus, or facts from his life. Of this character seems actually to have been that ancient work, *The Preaching of Peter* (Κήρυγμα Πέτρου), which was used by Heracleon,[2] and by Clement[3] of Alexandria, as an authentic canonical work,[4] denounced by Origen[5] on account of the consideration in which it was held by many, but still quoted with respect by Gregory of Nazianzum.[6] There can be no doubt that the Κήρυγμα Πέτρου, although it failed to obtain a permanent place in the canon, was

[1] Augustine calls Mark the follower and abbreviator of Matthew. "*Tanquam pedisequus et breviator Matthæi.*" *De Consensu Evang.*, i. 2.

[2] Origen, *Comment. in Joan.*, xiii. 17.

[3] *Strom.*, i. 29, § 182, vi. 5, § 39, 6, § 48, 15, § 128.

[4] The work is generally quoted by the latter with the introduction, "Peter in the Preaching says:" Πέτρος ἐν τῷ κήρυγματι λέγει, κ.τ.λ.

[5] *De Princip. Præf.*, 8.

Ep. xvi. (*ad Cæsar.*, i.). Cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 812.

one of the most ancient works of the Christian Church, dating probably from the first century, and, like the work described by Papias, it also was held to have been composed in Rome in connection with the preaching there of Peter and Paul. It must be noted, moreover, that Papias does not call the work ascribed to Mark a Gospel, but merely a record of the preaching of Peter.

It is not necessary for us to account for the manner in which the work referred to by the Presbyter John disappeared, and the present Gospel according to Mark became substituted for it. The merely negative evidence that our actual Gospel is not the work described by Papias is sufficient for our purpose. Any one acquainted with the thoroughly uncritical character of the Fathers, and with the literary history of the early Christian Church, will readily conceive the facility with which this can have been accomplished. The great mass of intelligent critics are agreed that our Synoptic Gospels have assumed their present form only after repeated modifications by various editors of earlier evangelical works. These changes have not been effected without traces being left by which the various materials may be separated and distinguished; but the more primitive Gospels have entirely disappeared, naturally supplanted by the later and amplified versions. The critic, however, who distinguishes between the earlier and later matter is not bound to perform the now impossible feat of producing the originals, or accounting in any but a general way for the disappearance of the primitive Gospel.

Tischendorf asks: "How then has neither Eusebius nor any other theologian of Christian antiquity thought that the expressions of Papias were in contradiction with the two Gospels (Mt. and Mk.)?"[1] The absolute credulity with which those theologians accepted any fiction, however childish, which had a pious tendency, and the frivolous character of the only criticism in which they indulged, render their unquestioning application of the tradition of Papias to our Gospels anything but singular, and it is only surprising to find their silent acquiescence elevated into an argument. We have already, in the course of these pages, seen something of the singularly credulous and uncritical character of the Fathers, and we cannot afford space to give instances of the absurdities with which their writings abound. No fable could be too gross, no invention too transparent, for their unsuspicious acceptance, if it assumed a pious form or tended to edification. No period in the history of the world ever produced so many spurious works as the first two or three centuries of our era. The

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 107.

name of every Apostle, or Christian teacher, not excepting that of the great Master himself, was freely attached to every description of religious forgery. False gospels, epistles, acts, martyrologies, were unscrupulously circulated, and such pious falsification was not even intended, or regarded, as a crime, but perpetrated for the sake of edification. It was only slowly and after some centuries that many of these works, once, as we have seen, regarded with pious veneration, were excluded from the canon; and that genuine works shared this fate, while spurious ones usurped their places, is one of the surest results of criticism. The Fathers omitted to inquire critically when such investigation might have been of value, and mere tradition credulously accepted and transmitted is of no critical value.[1] In an age when the multiplication of copies of any work was a slow process, and their dissemination a matter of difficulty and even danger, it is easy to understand with what facility the more complete and artistic Gospel could take the place of the original notes as the work of Mark.

The account given by Papias of the work ascribed to Matthew is as follows: "Matthew composed the oracles in the Hebrew dialect, and every one interpreted them as he was able."[2] Critics are divided in opinion as to whether this tradition was, like that regarding Mark, derived from the Presbyter John, or is given merely on the authority of Papias himself. Eusebius joins the account of Mark to that given by Matthew merely by the following words: "These facts Papias relates concerning Mark: but regarding Matthew he has said as follows:"[3] Eusebius distinctly states that the account regarding Mark is derived from the Presbyter, and the only reason for ascribing to him also that concerning Matthew is that it is not excluded by the phraseology of Eusebius; and, the two passages being given by him consecutively —however they may have stood in the work of Papias it is reasonable enough to suppose that the information was derived from the same source. The point is not of much importance, but it is clear that there is no absolute right to trace this statement to the Presbyter John, as there is in the case of the tradition about Mark.

This passage has excited even more controversy than that regarding Mark, and its interpretation and application are still

[1] Dr. Westcott himself admits that "the proof of the Canon is rendered more difficult by the uncritical character of the first two centuries." He says: "The spirit of the ancient world was essentially uncritical" (*On the Canon*, p. 7 f.).

[2] Ματθαίος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. Ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος. Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39.

[3] Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἱστόρηται τῷ Παπίᾳ περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου. Περὶ δὲ του Ματθαίου ταῦτ' εἴρηται. Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39.

keenly debated. The intricacy and difficulty of the questions which it raises are freely admitted by some of the most earnest defenders of the canonical Gospels, but the problem, so far as our examination is concerned, can be solved without much trouble. The dilemma in which apologists find themselves when they attempt closely to apply the description of this work given by Papias to our canonical Gospel is the great difficulty which complicates the matter and prevents a clear and distinct solution of the question. We shall avoid minute discussion of details, contenting ourselves with the broader features of the argument, and seeking only to arrive at a just conclusion as to the bearing of the evidence of Papias upon the claim to authenticity of our canonical Gospel.

The first point which we have to consider is the nature of the work which is here described. Matthew is said to have composed the Λόγια or Oracles, and there can be little doubt from the title of his own book, *Exposition of the Lord's Oracles* (*Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις*), that these oracles referred to by Papias were the Discourses of Jesus. Does the word λόγια, however, mean strictly oracles or discourses alone, or does it include within its fair signification also historical narrative? Were the "Λόγια" here referred to a simple collection of the discourses of Jesus, or a complete Gospel like that in our canon bearing the name of Matthew? That the natural interpretation of the word is merely "oracles" is indirectly admitted, even by the most thorough apologists, when they confess the obscurity of the expression—obscurity, however, which simply appears to exist from the difficulty of straining the word to make it apply to the Gospel. "In these sentences," says Tischendorf, referring to the passage about Matthew, "there is much obscurity; for instance, it is doubtful whether we have rightly translated 'Discourses of the Lord,'"[1] and he can only extend the meaning to include historical narrative by leaving the real meaning of the word, and interpreting it by supposed analogy.

There can be no doubt that the direct meaning of the word λόγια anciently and at the time of Papias was simply—words or oracles of a sacred character, and, however much the signification became afterwards extended, that it was not then at all applied to doings as well as sayings. There are many instances of this original and limited signification in the New Testament;[2] and

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 106 f.

[2] "They were entrusted with the oracles of God," τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, Rom. iii. 2. "The first principles of the oracles of God," τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ, Heb. v. 12. "Let him speak as the oracles of God," ὡς λόγια Θεοῦ, 1 Pet. iv. 11. Cf. Suicer, *Thes. Eccles.*, ii., p. 247 f. Dr. Lightfoot (*Contemp. Rev.*, 1875, p. 400 f.) argues that in the first of the above passages

there is no linguistic precedent for straining the expression used at that period to mean anything beyond a collection of sayings of Jesus which were estimated as oracular or divine, nor is there any reason for thinking that τὰ λόγια was here used in any other sense. It is argued, on the other hand, that in the preceding passage upon Mark a more extended meaning of the word is indicated. The Presbyter John says that Mark, as the interpreter of Peter, wrote, without order, "the things which were either said or done by Christ" (τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα), and then, apologising for him, he goes on to say that Peter, whom he followed, adapted his teaching to the occasion, "and not as making a consecutive record of the oracles (λογίων) of the Lord." Here, it is said, the word λογίων is used in reference both to sayings and doings, and, therefore, in the passage on Matthew τὰ λόγια must not be understood to mean only λεχθέντα, but also includes, as in the former case, the πραχθέντα. For these and similar reasons -in very many cases largely influenced by the desire to see in these λόγια our actual Gospel according to Matthew -many critics have maintained that τὰ λόγια in this place may be understood to include historical narrative as well as discourses. The arguments by which they arrive at this conclusion, however, seem to us to be based upon thorough misconception of the direct meaning of the passage. Few, or none, of these critics would deny that the simple inter-

Paul's expression, "the oracles of God," can mean nothing else than the O. T. Scriptures, and, therefore, includes the historical books of Genesis, Joshua, Samuel, etc. We must maintain that Paul certainly does not refer to a collection of writings, but to the communications or revelations of God, and, as the context shows, probably more immediately to the Messianic prophecies. The advantage of the Jews, in fact, according to Paul here, was that to them were first communicated the divine oracles: that they were made the medium of God's utterances to mankind. There seems almost an echo of the expression in Acts vii. 38, where Stephen is represented as saying to the Jews of their fathers on Mount Sinai: "who received living oracles (λόγια ζῶντα) to give unto us." Of this nature were "the oracles of God" entrusted to the Jews. Further, the phrase, "the first principles of the oracles of God" (Heb. v. 12), is no application of the term to narrative, as is argued, however much the author may illustrate his own teaching by O. T. history; but the writer of the Epistle clearly explains his own meaning in the first and second verses of his letter, when he says: "God having spoken to the fathers in time past in the prophets, at the end of these days spake unto us in his Son." Dr. Lightfoot also urges that Philo applies the term "oracle" (λόγιον) to the *narrative* in Gen. iv. 15, etc. The fact is, however, that Philo considered almost every part of the O. T. as allegorical, and held that narrative or descriptive phrases frequently veiled divine oracles. When he applies the term "oracle" to any of these, it is not to the narrative, but to the divine utterance which he believes to be mystically contained in it, and which he extracts and expounds in the usual extravagant manner of Alexandrian typologists.

pretation of τὰ λόγια, at that period, was oracular sayings.[1] Papias shows his preference for discourses in the very title of his lost book, *Exposition of the* λογίων *of the Lord*, and in the account which he gives of the works attributed to Mark and Matthew the discourses evidently attracted his chief interest. Now, in the passage regarding Mark, instead of λογίων being made the equivalent of λεχθέντα and πραχθέντα, the very reverse is the fact. The Presbyter says Mark wrote what he remembered of the things which were said or done by Christ, although not in order, and he apologises for his doing this on the ground that he had not himself been a *hearer* of the Lord, but merely reported what he had heard from Peter, who adapted his teaching to the occasion, and did *not* attempt to give a consecutive record of the oracles (λογίων) of the Lord. Mark, therefore, could not do so either. Matthew, on the contrary, he states, did compose the oracles (τὰ λόγια). There is an evident contrast made—Mark wrote ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα because he had not the means of writing the oracles; but Matthew composed the λόγια. Papias clearly distinguishes the work of Mark, who had written reminiscences of what Jesus had said and done from that of Matthew, who had made a collection of hi discourses.

It is impossible upon any but arbitrary grounds, and from a foregone conclusion, to maintain that a work commencing with a detailed history of the birth and infancy of Jesus, his genealogy, and the preaching of John the Baptist, and concluding with an equally minute history of his betrayal, trial, crucifixion, and resurrection; which relates all the miracles, and has for its evident aim throughout the demonstration that Messianic prophecy was fulfilled in Jesus, could be entitled τὰ λόγια: the oracles or discourses of the Lord.

Partly for these, but also for other important reasons, some of which shall presently be referred to, the great majority of critics deny that the work described by Papias can be the same as the Gospel in our canon bearing the name of Matthew. Whilst of those who suppose that the (Aramaic) original of which Papias speaks may have been substantially similar to it in construction, very few affirm that the work did not receive much subsequent

[1] Tischendorf himself, in a note, says: "Rufinus translates the word λόγια, according to the old linguistic usage, by *oracula*. It is in the highest degree probable that in fact the book of Papias, according to the Millenarian standing-point of the man, was dedicated specially to prophecies of the Lord. Christian linguistic usage, however, gave the word a wider signification, so that the sayings of the Lord and of the Apostles, even when they had not the particular character of prophecy, were so called, and Holy Scripture was designated θεῖα λόγια" (*Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 102, note 1).

manipulation, addition, and alteration, necessarily including translation, before it assumed the form in which the Gospel now lies before us; and many of them altogether deny its actual apostolic origin.

The next most important and obvious point is that the work described in this passage was written by Matthew in the Hebrew or Aramaic dialect, and each one who did not understand that dialect was obliged to translate as best he could. Our Gospel according to Matthew, however, is in Greek. Tischendorf, who is obliged to acknowledge the Greek originality of our actual Gospel, and that it is not a translation from another language, recognises the inevitable dilemma in which this fact places apologists, and has, with a few other critics, no better argument with which to meet it than the simple suggestion that Papias must have been mistaken in saying that Matthew wrote in Hebrew.[1] Just as much of the testimony as is convenient or favourable is eagerly claimed by such apologists, and the rest, which destroys its applicability to our Gospel, is set aside as a mistake. Tischendorf perceives the difficulty, but, not having arguments to meet it, he takes refuge in feeling. "In this," he says, "there lies before us one of the most complicated questions, whose detailed treatment would here not be in place. For our part, we are fully at rest concerning it, in the conviction that the assumption by Papias of a Hebrew original text of Matthew, which already in his time cannot have been limited to himself and was soon repeated by other men, arises only from a misunderstanding."[2] It is difficult to comprehend why it should be considered out of place, in a work specially written to establish the authenticity of the Gospels, to discuss fully so vital a point; and its deliberate evasion in such a manner alone can be deemed out of place.[3]

We may here briefly remark that Tischendorf and others[4] repeat with approval the disparaging expressions against Papias which Eusebius, for dogmatic reasons, did not scruple to use, and in this way they seek somewhat to depreciate his testimony, or at least indirectly to warrant their free handling of it. It is true that Eusebius says that Papias was a man of very limited comprehension[5] (*σφόδρα γάρ τοι σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν*), but this is

[1] Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 107 f.

[2] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 107 f.

[3] Dr. Westcott scarcely refers to the subject at all, and indeed on other points which are inconvenient in the evidence of Papias regarding Matthew's work he preserves almost complete silence, and assumes, with hardly a hint of doubt or uncertainty, the orthodox conclusions (*On the Canon*, pp. 59–62; 4th ed., p. 68 ff.).

[4] Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, pp. 106–111.

[5] *H. E.*, iii. 39. The passage (iii. 36) in which, on the contrary, Papias is called "a man in all respects most learned" (*ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα*

acknowledged to be on account of his Millenarian opinions, to which Eusebius was vehemently opposed. It must be borne in mind, however, that the Chiliastic passage from Papias quoted by Irenæus, and in which he certainly saw nothing foolish, is given on the authority of the Presbyter John, to whom, and not to Papias, any criticism upon it must be referred. If the passage be not of a very elevated character, it is quite in the spirit of that age. The main point, however, is that in regard to the testimony of Papias we have little to do with his general ability, for all that was requisite was the power to see, hear, and accurately state very simple facts. He repeats what is told him by the Presbyter, and, in such matters, we presume that the Bishop of Hierapolis must be admitted to have been competent.

There is no point, however, on which the testimony of the Fathers is more invariable and complete than that the work of Matthew was written in Hebrew or Aramaic. The first mention of any work ascribed to Matthew occurs in the account communicated by Papias, in which, as we have seen, it is distinctly said that Matthew wrote "in the Hebrew dialect." Irenæus, the next writer who refers to the point, says: "Matthew also produced a written Gospel amongst the Hebrews in their own dialect," and that he did not derive his information solely from Papias may be inferred from his going on to state the epoch of Matthew's writings: "when Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the Church in Rome."[1] The evidence furnished by Pantænus is certainly independent of Papias. Eusebius states, with regard to him: "Of these Pantænus is said to have been one, and to have penetrated as far as India (Southern Arabia), where it is reported that he found the Gospel according to Matthew, which had been delivered before his arrival to some who had the knowledge of Christ, to whom Bartholomew, one of the Apostles, as it is said, had preached, and left them that writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters" (*αὐτοῖς τε Ἑβραίων γράμμασι τὴν τοῦ Ματθαίου καταλεῖψαι γραφήν*).[2] Jerome gives a still more circumstantial account of this: "Pantænus found that Bartholomew, one of the twelve Apostles, had there (in India) preached the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ according to the Gospel of Matthew, which was written in Hebrew letters (*quod Hebraicis literis scriptum*), and

λογιώτατος) is doubtful, as it is not found in the St. Petersburg Syriac edition, nor in several other old Greek MSS.; but, treated even as an ancient note by some one acquainted with the writings of Papias, it may be mentioned here.

[1] *Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Adv. Hær.*, iii. 1, § 1; Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 8.

[2] Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 10.

which, on returning to Alexandria, he brought with him."[1] It is quite clear that this was no version specially made by Bartholomew, for had he translated the Gospel according to Matthew from the Greek, for the use of persons in Arabia, he certainly would not have done so into Hebrew. Origen, according to Eusebius, "following the ecclesiastical canon," states what he has understood from tradition (ἐν παραδόσει) of the Gospels, and says: "The first written was that according to Matthew, once a publican, but afterwards an Apostle of Jesus Christ, who delivered it to the Jewish believers, composed in the Hebrew language."[2] Eusebius, in another place, makes a similar statement in his own name: "Matthew, having first preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go also to others delivered to them his Gospel written in their native language, and thus compensated those from whom he was departing for the want of his presence by the writing."[3] Cyril of Jerusalem says: "Matthew, who wrote the Gospel, wrote it in the Hebrew language."[4] Epiphanius, referring to the fact that the Nazarenes called the only Gospel which they recognised the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," continues: "As in very truth we can affirm that Matthew alone, in the New Testament, set forth and proclaimed the Gospel in the Hebrew language and in Hebrew characters";[5] and elsewhere he states that "Matthew wrote the Gospel in Hebrew."[6] The same tradition is repeated by Chrysostom,[7] Augustine,[8] and others.

Whilst the testimony of the Fathers was thus unanimous as to the fact that the Gospel ascribed to Matthew was originally written in Hebrew, no question ever seems to have arisen in their minds as to the character of the Greek version; much less was any examination made with the view of testing the accuracy of the translation. "Such inquiries were not in the spirit of Christian learned men generally of that time,"[9] as Tischendorf remarks in connection with the belief current in the early Church, and afterwards shared by Jerome, that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was the original of the Greek Gospel according to Matthew. The first who directly refers to the point, frankly confessing the total ignorance which generally prevailed, was Jerome. He states: "Matthew, who was also called Levi, who, from a publican,

[1] *De Vir. Ill.*, 36. [2] Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 25. [3] Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 24.

[4] Ματθαῖος ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, Ἑβραΐδι γλώσσῃ τοῦτο ἔγραψεν. Cat. 14.

[5] Ὡς τὰ ἀληθῆ ἐστιν εἰπεῖν ὅτι Ματθαῖος μόνος Ἑβραϊστὶ καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ ἐποιήσατο τὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔκθεσίν τε καὶ κήρυγμα. *Hær.*, xxx. 3: *ed. Petav.*, p. 127.

[6] .....ὁ Ματθαῖος Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασι γράφει τὸ εὐαγγελιον, κ.τ.λ. *Hær.*, li. 5; *ed. Pet.*, p. 426.

[7] *Hom. in Matth.*, i. [8] *De Consensu Evang.*, i. 2.

[9] Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 108.

became an Apostle, was the first who wrote a Gospel of Christ in Judæa in Hebrew language and letters, on account of those from amongst the circumcision who had believed; but who afterwards translated it into Greek is not sufficiently certain."[1] It was only at a much later period, when doubt began to arise, that the translation was wildly ascribed to the Apostles John, James, and others.[2]

The expression in Papias that "everyone interpreted them (the λόγια) as he was able" (ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν ἕνιατὸς ἕκαστος) has been variously understood by different critics, like the rest of the account. Schleiermacher explained the ἡρμήνευσε as translation by enlargement—Matthew merely collected the λόγια, and everyone added the explanatory circumstances of time and occasion as best he could.[3] This view, however, has not been largely adopted. Others consider that the expression refers to the interpretation which was given on reading it at the public meetings of Christians for worship; but there can be no doubt that, coming after the statement that the work was written in the Hebrew dialect, ἑρμηνεύειν can only mean simple translation. Some maintain that the passage implies the existence of many written translations, amongst which very probably was ours; whilst others affirm that the phrase merely signifies that, as there was no recognised translation, each one who had but an imperfect knowledge of the language, yet wished to read the work, translated the Hebrew for himself as best he could. Some consider that Papias or the Presbyter uses the verb in the past tense, ἡρμήνευσε, as contrasting the time when it was necessary for each to interpret as best he could with the period when, from the existence of a recognised translation, it was no longer necessary for them to do so, whilst others deny that any written translation of an authentic character was known to Papias at all. Now, the words in Papias are merely: "Matthew composed the λόγια in the Hebrew dialect,[4] and everyone interpreted them as he was able." The statement is perfectly simple and direct, and it is, at least, quite clear that it conveys the fact that when the work was composed transla-

[1] *Matthæus, qui et Levi, ex publicano apostolus, primus in Judæa, propter eos qui ex circumcisione crediderant, evangelium Christi Hebraicis litteris verbisque composuit: quod quis postea in Græcum transtulerit, non satis certum est.* Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 3.

[2] Cf. Theophylact, *Com. in Matth., Præm.*: *Auctor Synops. Script. Sacr.*; Athanasius, *Opp. Paris.*, ii., p. 155; *Evang. sec. Matth. ed. Matthæi*, p. 10.

[3] *Th. Studien u. Krit.*, 1832, p. 735 f.

[4] In connection with this it may be of interest to remember that, in the account of his conversion and the vision which he saw on his way to Damascus which Paul gives to King Agrippa in the Acts of the Apostles, he states that Jesus spoke to him "in the Hebrew dialect" (Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ), Acts xxvi. 14.

tion was requisite, and, as each one translated "as he was able," that no recognised translation existed to which all might have recourse. There is no contrast either necessarily or probably implied in the use of the past tense. The composition of the λόγια being, of course, referred to in the past tense, the same tense is simply continued in completing the sentence. The purpose is obviously to convey the fact that the work was composed in the Hebrew language. But even if it be taken that Papias intentionally uses the past tense in reference to the time when translations did not exist, nothing is gained. Papias may have known of many translations, but there is absolutely not a syllable which warrants the conclusion that he was acquainted with an authentic Greek version, although it is possible that he may have known of the existence of some Greek translations of no authority. The words used, however, imply that, if he did, he had no respect for any of them.

Thus the account of Papias, supported by the perfectly unanimous testimony of the Fathers, declares that the work composed by Matthew was written in the Hebrew or Aramaic dialect. The only evidence which asserts that Matthew wrote any work at all distinctly asserts that he wrote it in Hebrew. It is quite impossible to separate the statement of the authorship from that regarding the language. The two points are so indissolubly united that they stand or fall together. If it be denied that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, it cannot be asserted that he wrote at all. It is therefore perfectly certain from this testimony that Matthew cannot be declared the direct author of the Greek canonical Gospel bearing his name. At the very best it can only be a translation, by an unknown hand, of a work the original of which was early lost. None of the earlier Fathers ever ventured a conjecture as to how, when, or by whom the translation was effected. Jerome explicitly states that the translator of the work was unknown. The deduction is clear: our Greek Gospel, in so far as it is associated with Matthew at all, cannot at the utmost be more than a translation, but as the work of an unknown translator there cannot, in the absence of the original, or of satisfactory testimony of its accuracy, be any assurance that the translation faithfully renders the work of Matthew, or accurately conveys the sense of the original. All its Apostolical authority is gone. Even Michaelis long ago recognised this: "If the original text of Matthew be lost, and we have nothing but a Greek translation, then, frankly, we cannot ascribe any divine inspiration to the words; yea, it is possible that in various places the true meaning of the Apostle has been missed by the translator."[1] This was felt and argued by the Manicheans in the

[1] *Einl. N. T.*, ii., p. 997, cf. p. 1,003.

fourth century,[1] and by the Anabaptists at the time of the Reformation.[2] A wide argument might be opened out as to the dependence of the other two Gospels on this unauthenticated work.

The dilemma, however, is not yet complete. It was early remarked that our first canonical Gospel bears no real marks of being a translation at all, but is evidently an original, independent Greek work. Even men like Erasmus, Calvin, Cajetan, and Œcolampadius began to deny the statement that our Gospels showed any traces of Hebrew origin, and the researches of later scholars have so fully confirmed their doubts that few now maintain the primitive belief in a translation. We do not propose here to enter fully into this argument. It is sufficient to say that the great majority of competent critics declare that our first canonical Gospel is no translation, but an original Greek text; whilst of those who consider that they find in it traces of translation and of Hebrew origin, some barely deny the independent originality of the Greek Gospel, and few assert more than substantial agreement with the original, with more or less variation and addition often of a very decided character. The case, therefore, stands thus: The whole of the evidence which warrants our believing that Matthew wrote any work at all, distinctly, invariably, and emphatically asserts that he wrote that work in Hebrew or Aramaic; a Greek Gospel, therefore, as connected with Matthew, can only be a translation by an unknown hand, whose accuracy we have not, and never have had, the means of verifying. Our Greek Gospel, however, being an independent original Greek text, there is no ground whatever for ascribing it even indirectly to Matthew at all, the whole evidence of antiquity being emphatically opposed, and the Gospel itself laying no claim, to such authorship.

One or other of these alternatives must be adopted for our first Gospel, and either is absolutely fatal to its direct Apostolic origin. Neither as a translation from the Hebrew nor as an original Greek text can it claim Apostolic authority. This has been so well recognised, if not admitted, that some writers, with greater zeal than discretion, have devised fanciful theories to obviate the difficulty. These maintain that Matthew himself wrote both in Hebrew and in Greek, or at least that the translation was made during his own lifetime and under his own eye, and so on. There is not, however, a particle of evidence for any of these assertions, which are merely the arbitrary and groundless conjectures of embarrassed apologists.

It is manifest that upon this evidence both those who assert the

[1] Augustine, *Contra Faust.*, 32, 2; 33, 3.
[2] Sixtus Senensis, *Bibl. Sancta*, vii. 2, p. 924.

Hebrew original of Matthew's work and those who maintain that our Gospel is not a translation, but an original Greek composition, should logically deny its apostolicity. We need not say that this is not done, and that for dogmatic and other foregone conclusions many profess belief in the Apostolic authorship of the Gospel, although in doing so they wilfully ignore the facts, and in many cases merely claim a substantial, but not absolute, Apostolic origin for the work. A much greater number of the most able and learned critics, however, both from external and internal evidence, deny the Apostolic origin of our first canonical Gospel.

There is another fact to which we may briefly refer, which, from another side, shows that the work of Matthew, with which Papias was acquainted, was different from our Gospel. In a fragment from the fourth book of his lost work, which is preserved to us by Œcumenius and Theophylact, Papias relates the circumstances of the death of Judas Iscariot in a manner which is in contradiction to the account in the first Gospel. In Matthew xxvii. 5 the death of the traitor is thus related: "And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed and went and hanged himself."[1] The narrative in Papias is as follows: "Judas walked about in this world a great example of impiety; for his body having swollen so that, on an occasion when a waggon was moving on its way he could not pass it, he was crushed by the waggon, and his bowels gushed out."[2] Theophylact, in connection with this passage, adds other details, also apparently taken from the work of Papias; as, for instance, that, from his excessive corpulency, the eyes of Judas were so swollen that they could not see, and so sunk in his head that they could not be perceived even by the aid of the optical instruments of physicians; and that the rest of his body was covered with running sores and maggots, and so on in the manner of the early Christian ages, whose imagination conjured up the wildest "special providences" to punish the enemies of the faith. As Papias expressly states that he eagerly inquired what the Apostles and, amongst them, what Matthew said, we may conclude that he would not have deliberately contradicted the account given by that Apostle had he been acquainted with any work attributed to him which contained it.

It has been argued, from some very remote and imaginary resemblance between the passage from the preface to the work of Papias quoted by Eusebius with the prologue to Luke, that Papias was acquainted with that Gospel; but nothing could be more groundless than such a conclusion based upon such

[1] In Acts i. 18 f. an account is given which again contradicts both Matthew and the version of Papias.

[2] Œcumenius, *Comm. in Acta Apost.*, cap. ii.

evidence, and there is not a word in our fragments of Papias which warrants such an assertion. Eusebius does not mention that Papias knew either the third or fourth Gospel. Is it possible to suppose that if Papias had been acquainted with those Gospels he would not have asked for information about them from the Presbyters, or that Eusebius would not have recorded it as he did that regarding the works ascribed to Matthew and Mark? Eusebius states, however, that Papias "made use of testimonies from the first Epistle of John and, likewise, from that of Peter."[1] As Eusebius, however, does not quote the passages from Papias, we must remain in doubt whether he did not, as elsewhere, assume from some similarity of wording that the passages were quotations from these Epistles, whilst in reality they might not be. Andrew, a Cappadocian bishop of the fifth century, mentions that Papias, amongst others of the Fathers, considered the Apocalypse inspired.[2] No reference is made to this by Eusebius, but, although from his Millenarian tendencies it is very probable that Papias regarded the Apocalypse with peculiar veneration as a prophetic book, this evidence is too vague and isolated to be of much value.

We find, however, that Papias, like Hegesippus and others of the Fathers, was acquainted with the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Eusebius says: "He (Papias) has likewise related another history of a woman accused of many sins before the Lord, which is contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews."[3] This is generally believed to be the episode inserted in the later MSS. of the fourth Gospel, viii. 1–11.

Whatever books Papias knew, however, it is certain, from his own express declaration, that he ascribed little importance to them, and preferred tradition as a more beneficial source of information regarding evangelical history. "For I held that what was to be derived from books," he says, "did not so profit me as that from the living and abiding voice."[4] If, therefore, it could even have been shown that Papias was acquainted with any of our canonical Gospels, it must, at the same time, have been admitted that he did not recognise them as authoritative documents. It is manifest from the evidence adduced, however, that Papias did not know our Gospels. It is not possible that he could have found it better to inquire "what John or Matthew, or what any other of the disciples of the Lord.....say" if he had known of Gospels such as ours, and believed them to have been actually written by those Apostles, deliberately telling him what they had to say.

[1] Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39.
[2] *Proleg. Comment. in Apocalypsin*; Routh, *Relig. Sacræ*, 1846, i., p. 15.
[3] *H. E.*, iii. 39. [4] Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39.

The work of Matthew, which he mentions, being, however, a mere collection of discourses of Jesus, he might naturally inquire what the Apostle[1] himself said of the history and teaching of the Master. The evidence of Papias is, in every respect, most important. He is the first writer who mentions that Matthew and Mark were believed to have written any works at all; but, whilst he shows that he does not accord any canonical authority even to the works attributed to them, his description of those works and his general testimony come with crushing force against the pretensions made on behalf of our Gospels to Apostolic origin and authenticity.

[1] We may merely remark that Papias does not call the Matthew who wrote the λόγια an Apostle. In this sentence he speaks of the Apostle, but he does not distinctly identify him with the Matthew of the other passage.

CHAPTER V.

THE CLEMENTINES—THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS

We must now as briefly as possible examine the evidence furnished by the apocryphal religious romance generally known by the name of "The Clementines," and assuming, falsely of course, to be the composition of the Roman Clement. The Clementines are composed of three principal works, the *Homilies*, *Recognitions*, and a so-called *Epitome*. The *Homilies*, again, are prefaced by a pretended epistle addressed by the Apostle Peter to James, and another from Clement. These *Homilies* were only known in an imperfect form till 1853, when Dressel[1] published a complete Greek text. Of the *Recognitions* we only possess a Latin translation by Rufinus (A.D. 402). Although there is much difference of opinion regarding the claims to priority of the *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, many critics assigning that place to the *Homilies*, whilst others assert the earlier origin of the *Recognitions*, all are agreed that the one is merely a version of the other, the former being embodied almost word for word in the latter, whilst the *Epitome* is a blending of the other two, probably intended to purge them from heretical doctrine. These works, which are generally admitted to have emanated from the Ebionitic party of the early Church, are supposed to be based upon older Petrine writings, such as the "Preaching of Peter" (Κήρυγμα Πέτρου), and the "Travels of Peter" (Περίοδοι Πέτρου). It is not necessary for our purpose to go into any analysis of the character of the Clementines. It will suffice to say that they mainly consist of discussions between the Apostle Peter and Simon the Magician regarding the identity of the true Mosaic and Christian religions. Peter follows the Magician from city to city for the purpose of exposing and refuting him, the one, in fact, representing Apostolic doctrine and the other heresy; and in the course of these discussions occur the very numerous quotations of sayings of Jesus and of Christian history which we have to examine.

The *Clementine Recognitions*, as we have already remarked, are only known to us through the Latin translation of Rufinus; and, from a comparison of the evangelical quotations occurring in

[1] *Clementis R. quæ feruntur Homiliæ xx. nunc primum integræ.* Ed. A. R. M. Dressel.

that work with the same in the *Homilies*, it is evident that Rufinus has assimilated them, in the course of translation, to the parallel passages of our Gospels. It is admitted, therefore, that no argument regarding the source of the quotations can rightly be based upon the *Recognitions*, and that work may, consequently, be entirely set aside, and the *Clementine Homilies* alone occupy our attention.

We need scarcely remark that, unless the date at which these *Homilies* were composed can be ascertained, their value as testimony for the existence of our Synoptic Gospels is seriously affected. The difficulty of arriving at a correct conclusion regarding this point, great under almost any circumstances, is increased by the fact that the work is altogether apocryphal, and most certainly not held by any one to have been written by the person whose name it bears. There is, in fact, nothing but internal evidence by which to fix the date, and that evidence is of a character which admits of very wide extension down the course of time, although a sharp limit is set beyond which it cannot mount upwards. Of external evidence there is almost none, and what little exists does not warrant an early date. Origen, it is true, mentions Περίοδοι Κλήμεντος,[1] which, it is conjectured, may either be the same work as the Ἀναγνωρισμός, or *Recognitions*, translated by Rufinus, or related to it, and Epiphanius and others refer to Περίοδοι Πέτρου;[2] but our *Clementine Homilies* are not mentioned by any writer before pseudo-Athanasius.[3] The work, therefore, can at the best afford no substantial testimony to the antiquity and apostolic origin of our Gospels. Hilgenfeld, following in the steps of Baur, arrives at the conclusion that the *Homilies* are directed against the Gnosticism of Marcion (and also, as we shall hereafter see, against the Apostle Paul), and he, therefore, necessarily assigns to them a date subsequent to A.D. 160. As Reuss, however, inquires: upon this ground, why should a still later date not be named, since even Tertullian wrote vehemently against the same Gnosis?[4] There can be little doubt that the author was a representative of Ebionitic Gnosticism, which had once been the purest form of primitive Christianity; but later, through its own development, though still more through the rapid growth around it of Paulinian doctrine, had assumed a position closely verging upon heresy. It is not necessary for us, however, to enter upon any exhaustive discussion of the date at which the

[1] *Comment. in Genesin Philoc.*, 22.

[2] Hilgenfeld considers *Recog.* iv.–vi., *Hom.* vii.–xi., a version of the Περίοδοι Πέτρου: *Die ap. Vater*, p. 291 ff.; Ritschl does not consider that this can be decidedly proved, *Entst. Altk. Kirche*, p. 204 f.; so also Uhlhorn, *Die Hom. u. Recog.*, p. 71 ff.

[3] *Synops. Sacr. Script., sub finem.*

[4] *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 254.

Clementines were written ; it is sufficient to show that there is no certain ground upon which a decision can be based, and that even an approximate conjecture can scarcely be reasonably advanced. Critics variously date the composition of the original *Recognitions* from about the middle of the second century to the end of the third, though the majority are agreed in placing them at least in the latter century. They assign to the *Homilies* an origin at different dates within a period commencing about the middle of the second century, and extending to one or two centuries later.

In the *Homilies* there are very numerous quotations of sayings of Jesus and of Gospel history, which are generally placed in the mouth of Peter, or introduced with such formulæ as : "The teacher said," "Jesus said," "He said," "The prophet said"; but in no case does the author name the source from which these sayings and quotations are derived. That he does, however, quote from a written source, and not from tradition, is clear from the use of such expressions as "in another place (ἄλλῃ που)[1] he has said," which refer not to other localities or circumstances, but another part of a written history. There are in the *Clementine Homilies* upwards of a hundred quotations of sayings of Jesus or references to his history, too many for us to examine in detail here ; but, notwithstanding the number of these passages, so systematically do they vary, more or less, from the parallels in our canonical Gospels that, as in the case of Justin, apologists are obliged to have recourse to the elastic explanation, already worn so threadbare, of "free quotation from memory" and "blending of passages" to account for the remarkable phenomena presented. It must be evident that the necessity for such an apology shows the insufficiency of the evidence furnished by these quotations. De Wette says: "The quotations of evangelical works and histories in the pseudo-Clementine writings, from their nature free and inaccurate, permit only an uncertain conclusion to be drawn as to their written source."[2] Critics have maintained very different and conflicting views regarding that source. Apologists, of course, assert that the quotations in the *Homilies* are taken from our Gospels only. Others ascribe them to our Gospels, with a supplementary apocryphal work : the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or the Gospel according to Peter. Some, whilst admitting a subsidiary use of some of our Gospels, assert that the author of the *Homilies* employs, in preference, the Gospel according to Peter ; whilst others, recognising also the similarity of the features presented by these quotations with those of Justin's, conclude that the author does not quote our Gospels at all, but makes use of the Gospel

[1] See several instances, *Hom.* xix. 2.

[2] *Einl. N. T.*, p. 115.

according to Peter, or the Gospel according to the Hebrews.[1] Evidence permitting of such divergent conclusions manifestly cannot be of a decided character. We may affirm that few of those who are willing to admit the use of our Synoptics by the author of the *Homilies*, along with other sources, make that concession on the strength of the isolated evidence of the *Homilies* themselves, but they are generally moved by antecedent views on the point. In an inquiry like that which we have undertaken, however, such easy and indifferent judgment would obviously be out of place, and the point we have to determine is not whether an author may have been acquainted with our Gospels, but whether he furnishes testimony that he actually was in possession of our present Gospels and regarded them as authoritative.

We have already mentioned that the author of the *Clementine Homilies* never names the source from which his quotations are derived. Of these very numerous quotations we must again distinctly state that only two or three, of a very brief and fragmentary character, literally agree with our Synoptics, whilst all the rest differ more or less widely from the parallel passages in those Gospels. Some of these quotations are repeated more than once with the same persistent and characteristic variations, and in several cases, as we have already stated, they agree more or less closely with quotations of Justin from the *Memoirs of the Apostles*. Others, again, have no parallels at all in our Gospels, and even apologists are consequently compelled to admit the collateral use of an apocryphal Gospel. As in the case of Justin, therefore, the singular phenomenon is presented of a vast number of quotations of which only one or two brief phrases, too fragmentary to avail as evidence, perfectly agree with our Gospels; whilst of the rest, which all vary more or less, some merely resemble combined passages of two Gospels, others only contain the sense, some present variations likewise found in other writers or in various parts of the *Homilies*, and are repeatedly quoted with the same variations, and others are not found in our Gospels at all. Such characteristics cannot be fairly accounted for by any mere theory of imperfect memory or negligence. The systematic variation from our Synoptics, variation proved by repetition not to be accidental, coupled with quotations which have no parallels at all in our Gospels, more naturally point to the use of a different Gospel. In no case can the *Homilies* be accepted as furnishing evidence even of the existence of our Gospels.

As it is impossible here to examine in detail all of the quotations

[1] Credner, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Zeller, and others, consider that the author uses the same Gospel as Justin.

in the *Clementine Homilies*, we must content ourselves with this distinct statement of their character, and merely illustrate the different classes of quotations, exhausting, however, those which literally agree with passages in the Gospels. The most determined of recent apologists do not afford us an opportunity of testing the passages upon which they base their assertion of the use of our Synoptics, for they simply assume that the author used them without producing instances.[1]

The first quotation agreeing with a passage in our Synoptics occurs in *Hom.* iii. 52: "And he cried, saying: Come unto me all ye that are weary," which agrees with the opening words of Matt. xi. 28; but the phrase does not continue, and is followed by the explanation, "that is, who are seeking the truth and not finding it."[2] It is evident that so short and fragmentary a phrase cannot prove anything.

The next passage occurs in *Hom.* xviii. 15: "For Isaiah said: I will open my mouth in parables, and I will utter things that have been kept secret from the foundation of the world."[3] This passage, with a slightly different order of words, is found in Matt. xiii. 35. After giving a series of parables, the author of the Gospel says (v. 34): "All these things spake Jesus unto the multitudes in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them; (v. 35) That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet (Isaiah), saying: I will open my mouth in parables, &c." There are two peculiarities which must be pointed out in this passage. It is not found in Isaiah, but in Psalm lxxviii. 2,[4] and it presents a variation from the version of the lxx. Both the variation and the erroneous reference to Isaiah, therefore, occur also in the Homily, and it is upon this similarity of mistake that the apologetic argument mainly rests. The first part of the sentence agrees with, but the latter part is quite different from, the Greek of the lxx., which reads: "I will utter problems from the beginning," *φθέγξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*.[5]

The Psalm from which the quotation is really taken is, by its superscription, ascribed to Asaph, who, in the Septuagint version

[1] Tischendorf only devotes a dozen lines, with a note, to the *Clementines*, and only in connection with our fourth Gospel, which shall hereafter have our attention (*Wann wurden u. s. w.*, p. 90). In the same way Dr. Westcott passes them over in a short paragraph, merely asserting the allusions to our Gospels to be "generally admitted," and only directly referring to one supposed quotation from Mark which we shall presently examine, and one which he affirms to be from the fourth Gospel (*On the Canon*, p. 251 f. In the 4th edition he has enlarged his remarks, p. 282 ff.).

[2] *Hom.* iii. 52. [3] *Hom.* xviii. 15.

[4] The Vulgate reads: *aperiam in parabolis os meum: loquar propositiones ab initio.* Ps. lxxvii. 2.

[5] Ps. lxxvii. 2.

of 2 Chronicles xxix. 30, is called a prophet. It was, therefore, early asserted that the original reading of Matthew was "Asaph," instead of "Isaiah." Porphyry, in the third century, twitted Christians with this erroneous ascription by their inspired evangelist to Isaiah of a passage from a Psalm, and reduced the Fathers to great straits. Eusebius, in his commentary on this verse of the Psalm, attributes the insertion of the words, "by the prophet Isaiah," to unintelligent copyists, and asserts that in accurate MSS. the name is not added to the word prophet. Jerome likewise ascribes the insertion of the name Isaiah for that of Asaph, which was originally written, to an ignorant scribe,[1] and in the commentary on the Psalms, generally, though probably falsely, ascribed to him, the remark is made that many copies of the Gospel to that day had the name "Isaiah," for which Porphyry had reproached Christians,[2] and the writer of the same commentary actually allows himself to make the assertion that Asaph was found in all the old codices, but ignorant men had removed it.[3] The fact is, that the reading "Asaph" for "Isaiah" is not found in any extant MS., and, although "Isaiah" has disappeared from all but a few obscure codices, it cannot be denied that the name anciently stood in the text. In the *Sinaitic Codex*, which is probably the earliest MS. extant, and which is assigned to the fourth century, "the prophet *Isaiah*" stands in the text by the first hand, but is erased by the second (B).

The quotation in the Homily, however, is clearly not from our Gospel. It is introduced by the words "For Isaiah says"; and the context is so different from that in Matthew that it seems most improbable that the author of the Homily could have had the passage suggested to him by the Gospel. It occurs in a discussion between Simon the Magician and Peter. The former undertakes to prove that the Maker of the world is not the highest God, and amongst other arguments he advances the passage, "No man knew the Father," etc., to show that the Father had remained concealed from the Patriarchs, etc., until revealed by the Son; and in reply to Peter he retorts, that if the supposition that the Patriarchs were not deemed worthy to know the Father was unjust, the Christian teacher himself was to blame who said, "I thank thee, Lord of heaven and earth, that what was concealed from the wise thou hast revealed to suckling babes."

[1] *Comment. Matt.*, xiii. 35.

[2] *Multa evangelia usque hodie ita habent: Ut impleretur, quod scriptum est per* Isaiam *prophetam*, etc. Hieron., *Opp.*, vii., p. 270 f.

[3] *Asaph invenitur in omnibus veteribus codicibus, sed homines ignorantes tulerunt illud.* To this Credner pertinently remarks: "*Die Noth, in welche die guten Kirchenväter durch Porphyrius gekommen waren, erlaubte auch eine Lüge. Sie geschah ja: in majorem Dei gloriam*" (*Beiträge*, i., p. 304).

Peter argues that in the statement of Jesus, "No man knew the Father," etc., he cannot be considered to indicate another God and Father from him who made the world, and he continues: "For the concealed things of which he spoke may be those of the Creator himself; for Isaiah says, 'I will open my mouth,' etc. Do you admit, therefore, that the prophet was not ignorant of the things concealed?"[1] and so on. There is absolutely nothing in this argument to indicate that the passage was suggested by the Gospel, but, on the contrary, it is used in a totally different way, and is quoted not as an evangelical text, but as a saying from the Old Testament, and treated in connection with the prophet himself, and not with its supposed fulfilment in Jesus. It may be remarked that in the corresponding part of the *Recognitions*, whether that work be of older or more recent date, the passage does not occur at all. Now, although it is impossible to say how and where this erroneous reference to a passage of the Old Testament first occurred, there is no reason for affirming that it originated in our first Synoptic, and as little for asserting that its occurrence in the *Clementine Homilies*, with so different a context and object, involves the conclusion that their author derived it from the Gospel, and not from the Old Testament or some other source. On the contrary, the peculiar argument based upon it in the *Homilies* suggests a different origin, and it is very probable that the passage, with its erroneous reference, was derived by both from another and common source.

Another passage is a phrase from the "Lord's Prayer," which occurs in *Hom.* xix. 2: "But also in the prayer which he commended to us we have it said: Deliver us from the evil one" (Ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ). It need scarcely be said that few Gospels can have been composed without including this prayer, and the occurrence of this short phrase demonstrates nothing more than the mere fact that the author of the *Homilies* was acquainted with one of the most universally known lessons of Jesus, or made use of a Gospel which contained it. There would have been cause for wonder had he been ignorant of it.

The only other passage which agrees literally with our Gospels is also a mere fragment from the parable of the Talents, and when the other references to the same parable are added, it is evident that the quotation is not from our Gospels. In *Hom.* iii. 65 the address to the good servant is introduced, "Well done, good and faithful servant" (Εὖ, δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστὲ), which agrees with the words in Matt. xxv. 21. The allusion to the parable of the talents in the context is perfectly clear, and the passage occurs in an address of the Apostle Peter to overcome the

[1] *Hom.* xviii. 1–15.

modest scruples of Zaccheus, the former publican, who has been selected by Peter as his successor in the Church of Cæsarea when he is about to leave in pursuit of Simon the Magician. Anticipating the possibility of his hesitating to accept the office, Peter, in an earlier part of his address, however, makes fuller allusions to the same parable of the talents, which we must contrast with the parallel in the first Synoptic. "But if any of those present, having the ability to instruct the ignorance of men, shrink back from it, considering only his own ease, then let him expect to hear:"

Hom. iii. 61.	Matt. xxv. 26–30.
Thou wicked and slothful servant;	v. 26. Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather from where I strawed not.
thou oughtest to have put out my money with the exchangers, and at my coming I should have exacted mine own.	v. 27. Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and at my coming I should have received mine own with usury.
	v. 28, 29. Take therefore, etc.
Cast ye the unprofitable servant into the darkness without.	v. 30. And cast ye the unprofitable servant into the darkness without; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.
Δοῦλε πονηρὲ καὶ ὀκνηρέ,	v. 26. *Πονηρὲ δοῦλε καὶ ὀκνηρέ, ἤδεις ὅτι θερίζω, κ.τ.λ.*
ἔδει σε τὸ ἀργύριόν μου προβαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῶν τραπεζιτῶν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἂν ἐλθὼν ἔπραξα τὸ ἐμόν·	v. 27. *ἔδει σε οὖν βαλεῖν τὸ ἀργύριόν μου τοῖς τραπεζίταις, καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐγὼ ἐκομισάμην*[1] *ἂν τὸ ἐμὸν σὺν τόκῳ.*
	v. 28, 29. *ἄρατε οὖν, κ.τ.λ.*
ἐκβάλετε τὸν ἀχρεῖον δοῦλον εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον.	v. 30. *καὶ τὸν ἀχρεῖον δοῦλον ἐκβάλετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς, κ.τ.λ.*

The Homily does not end here, however, but continues in words not found in our Gospels at all: "And reasonably: 'For,' he says, "it is thine, O man, to put my words as silver with exchangers, and to prove them as money.'"[2] This passage is very analogous to another saying of Jesus, frequently quoted from an apocryphal Gospel, by the author of the *Homilies*, to which we shall hereafter more particularly refer, but here merely point out: "Be ye approved money-changers" (*γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι*).[3] The variations from the parallel passages in the first and third Gospels, the peculiar application of the parable to the *words* of Jesus, and the addition of a saying not found in our Gospels, warrant us in denying that the quotations we are considering can

[1] Luke xix. 23 substitutes *ἔπραξα* for *ἐκομισάμην*.

[2] *Καὶ εὐλόγως. Σοὶ γάρ, φησὶν, ἄνθρωπε, τοὺς λόγους μου ὡς ἀργύριον ἐπὶ τραπεζιτῶν βαλεῖν, καὶ ὡς χρήματα δοκιμάσαι. Hom.* iii. 61.

[3] *Hom.* iii. 50; ii. 51, etc.

be appropriated by our canonical Gospels, and, on the contrary, give good reason for the conclusion that the author derived his knowledge of the parable from another source.

There is no other quotation in the *Clementine Homilies* which literally agrees with our Gospels, and it is difficult, without incurring the charge of partial selection, to illustrate the systematic variation in such very numerous passages as occur in these writings. It would be tedious and unnecessary to repeat the test applied to the quotations of Justin, and give in detail the passages from the Sermon on the Mount which are found in the *Homilies*. Some of these will come before us presently ; but with regard to the whole, which are not less than fifty, we may broadly and positively state that they all more or less differ from our Gospels. To take the severest test, however, we shall compare those further passages which are specially adduced as most closely following our Gospels, and neglect the vast majority which widely differ from them. In addition to the passages which we have already examined, Credner[1] points out the following. The first is from *Hom.* xix. 2[2] : "If Satan cast out Satan he is divided against himself : how then can his kingdom stand ?" In the first part of this sentence the Homily reads, ἐκβάλλῃ for the ἐκβάλλει of the first Gospel, and the last phrase in each is as follows :—

Hom. πῶς οὖν αὐτοῦ στήκῃ ἡ βασιλεία ;
Matt. πῶς οὖν σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ;

The third Gospel differs from the first as the Homily does from both. The next passage is from *Hom.* xix. 7[3] : "For thus, said our Father, who was without deceit : out of abundance of heart mouth speaketh." The Greek compared with that of Matt. xii. 34.

Hom. Ἐκ περισσεύματος καρδίας στόμα λαλεῖ
Matt. Ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ.

The form of the Homily is much more proverbial. The next passage occurs in *Hom.* iii. 52 : "Every plant which the heavenly Father did not plant shall be rooted up." This agrees with the parallel in Matt. xv. 13, with the important exception, that although in the mouth of Jesus, "*the* heavenly Father" is substituted for the "*my* heavenly Father" of the Gospel. The last passage pointed out by Credner is from *Hom.* viii. 4 : "But also 'many,' he said, 'called, but few chosen'"; which may be compared with Matt. xx. 16, etc.

Hom. Ἀλλὰ καὶ, πολλοί, φησὶν, κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.
Matt. πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.

We have already fully discussed this passage of the Gospel in connection with the "Epistle of Barnabas,"[4] and need not say more here.

[1] Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 285 ; cf. p. 302.
[2] Cf. Matt. xii. 26.
[3] Cf. Matt. xii. 34.
[4] P. 139 ff.

The variations in these passages, it may be argued, are not very important. Certainly, if they were the exceptional variations amongst a mass of quotations perfectly agreeing with parallels in our Gospels, it might be exaggeration to base upon such divergences a conclusion that they were derived from a different source. When it is considered, however, that the very reverse is the case, and that these are passages selected for their closer agreement out of a multitude of others, either more decidedly differing from our Gospels or not found in them at all, the case entirely changes; and, variations being the rule instead of the exception, these, however slight, become evidence of the use of a Gospel different from ours.

As an illustration of the importance of slight variations in connection with the question as to the source from which quotations are derived, the following may, at random, be pointed out: The passage, "See thou say nothing to any man, but go thy way, show thyself to the priest" (Ὅρα μηδενὶ εἴπῃς, ἀλλὰ ὕπαγε σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ), occurring in a work like the *Homilies* would, supposing our second Gospel no longer extant, be referred to Matt. viii. 4, with which it entirely agrees. It is, however, actually taken from Mark i. 44, and not from the first Gospel. Then, again, supposing that our first Gospel had shared the fate of so many others of the πολλοί of Luke, and in some early work the following passage was found: "A prophet is not without honour, except in his own country and in his own house" (Οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ), this passage would, undoubtedly, be claimed by apologists as a quotation from Mark vi. 4, and as proving the existence and use of that Gospel. The omission of the words "and among his own kin" (καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσιν αὐτοῦ) would at first be explained as mere abbreviation, or defect of memory; but on the discovery that part or all of these words are omitted from some MSS., that, for instance, the phrase is erased from the oldest manuscript known the *Cod. Sinaiticus*—the derivation from the second Gospel would be considered as established. The author, notwithstanding, might never have seen that Gospel, for the quotation is taken from Matt. xiii. 57.[1]

We have already quoted the opinion of De Wette as to the inconclusive nature of the deductions to be drawn from the quotations in the pseudo-Clementine writings regarding their source, but in pursuance of the plan we have adopted we shall now examine the passages which he cites as most nearly agreeing with our Gospels.[2] The first of these occurs in *Hom.* iii. 18: "The Scribes and the

[1] Cf. Matt. viii. 19–22; Luke ix. 57–60, etc.
[2] *Einl. N. T.*, p. 115.

Pharisees sit upon Moses' seat; all things, therefore, whatsoever they speak to you, hear them," which is compared with Matt. xxiii. 2, 3: "The Scribes and the Pharisees sit upon Moses' seats: all things, therefore, whatsoever they say to you, do and observe." We subjoin the Greek of the latter half of these passages:—

Hom. πάντα οὖν ὅσα λέγωσιν ὑμῖν, ἀκούετε αὐτῶν.
Matt. πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν ποιήσατε καὶ τηρεῖτε.[1]

That the variation in the Homily is deliberate and derived from the Gospel used by the author is clear from the continuation: "Hear *them* (αὐτῶν), he said, as entrusted with the key of the kingdom, which is knowledge, which alone is able to open the gate of life, through which alone is the entrance to eternal life. But verily, he says: They possess the key indeed, but to those who wish to enter in they do not grant it."[2] The αὐτῶν is here emphatically repeated, and the further quotation and reference to the denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees continue to differ distinctly from the account both in our first and third Gospels. The passage in Matt. xxiii. 13 reads: "But woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut the kingdom of heaven against men; for ye go not in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in."[3] The parallel in Luke xi. 52 is not closer. There the passage regarding Moses' seat is altogether wanting, and in verse 52, where the greater similarity exists, the "lawyers," instead of the "Scribes and Pharisees," are addressed. The verse reads: "Woe unto you, Lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered."[4] The first Gospel has not the direct image of the key at all: the Scribes and Pharisees "shut the kingdom of heaven"; the third has "the key of knowledge" (κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως) taken away by the lawyers, and not by the Scribes and Pharisees, whilst the Gospel of the *Homilies* has the key of the kingdom (κλεῖδα τῆς βασιλείας), and explains that this key is knowledge (ἥτις ἐστὶ γνῶσις). It is apparent that the first Gospel uses an

[1] It is unnecessary to point out the various readings of the three last words in various MSS. Whether shortened or inverted, the difference from the Homily remains the same.

[2] Λύτῶν δέ, εἶπεν, ὡς τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς βασιλείας πεπιστευμένων, ἥτις ἐστὶ γνῶσις, ἣ μόνη τὴν πύλην τῆς ζωῆς ἀνοῖξαι δύναται, δι' ἧς μόνης εἰς τὴν αἰωνίαν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν ἔστιν· Ἀλλὰ ναί, φησίν, κρατοῦσι μὲν τὴν κλεῖν, τοῖς δὲ βουλομένοις εἰσελθεῖν οὐ παρέχουσιν. *Hom.* iii. 18; cf. *Hom.* iii. 70, xviii. 15, 16.

[3] Οὐαί, κ.τ.λ.....ὅτι κλείετε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὑμεῖς γὰρ οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθε, οὐδὲ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἀφίετε εἰσελθεῖν. Matt. xxiii. 13.

[4] Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς, ὅτι ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως· αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθατε καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε. Luke xi. 52.

expression more direct than the others, whilst the third Gospel explains it; but the Gospel of the *Homilies* has in all probability the simpler original words, the "key of the kingdom," which both of the others have altered for the purpose of more immediate clearness. In any case, it is certain that the passage does not agree with our Gospel.

The next quotation referred to by De Wette is in *Hom.* iii. 51: "And also that he said: 'I am not come to destroy the law..... the heaven and the earth will pass away, but one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law.'" This is compared with Matt. v. 17, 18:[1] "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. (v. 18) For verily I say unto you: Till heaven and earth pass away one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." The Greek of both passages reads as follows:—

Hom. iii. 51.	Matt. v. 17, 18.
Τὸ δὲ καὶ εἰπεῖν αὐτόν·	Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμου ἢ τοὺς προφήτας· οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι.
Οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον.	
* * * *	v. 18. ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται.
Ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται ἰῶτα δὲ ἓν ἢ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου.	

That the omissions and variations in this passage are not accidental is proved by the fact that the same quotation occurs again literally in the Epistle from Peter[2] which is prefixed to the *Homilies* in which the παρελεύσονται is repeated, and the sentence closes at the same point. The author in that place adds: "This he said that all might be fulfilled" (τοῦτο δὲ εἴρηκεν, ἵνα τὰ πάντα γένηται). Hilgenfeld considers the Epistle of much more early date than the *Homilies*, and that this agreement bespeaks a particular text.[3] The quotation does not agree with our Gospels, and must be assigned to another source.

The next passage pointed out by De Wette is the erroneous quotation from Isaiah which we have already examined.[4] That which follows is found in *Hom.* viii. 7: "For on this account our Jesus himself said to one who frequently called him Lord, yet did nothing which he commanded: Why dost thou say to me Lord, Lord, and doest not the things which I say?" This is compared with Luke vi. 46[5]: "But why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"

Hom. viii. 7.	Luke vi. 46.
Τί με λέγεις, Κύριε, κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖς ἃ λέγω;	Τί δέ με καλεῖτε Κύριε, κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω;

[1] Cf. Luke xvi. 17. [2] § ii. [3] *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 340.
[4] P. 303 f.; cf. *Hom.* xviii. 15, Matt. xiii. 35. [5] Cf. Matt. vii. 21.

This passage differs from our Gospels in having the second person singular instead of the plural, and in substituting λέγεις for καλεῖτε in the first phrase. The Homily, moreover, in accordance with the use of the second person singular, distinctly states that the saying was addressed to a person who frequently called Jesus "Lord," whereas in the Gospels it forms part of the Sermon on the Mount, with a totally impersonal application to the multitude.

The next passage referred to by De Wette is in *Hom.* xix. 2: "And he declared that he saw the evil one as lightning fall from heaven." This is compared with Luke x. 18, which has no parallel in the other Gospels: "And he said to them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven."

Hom. xix. 2.	Luke x. 18.
Καὶ ὅτι ἑώρακε τὸν πονηρὸν ὡς ἀστραπὴν πεσόντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐδήλωσεν.	Εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἐθεώρουν τὸν σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα.

The substitution of τὸν πονηρὸν for τὸν σατανᾶν, had he found the latter in his Gospel, would be all the more remarkable from the fact that the author of the *Homilies* has just before quoted the saying, "If Satan cast out Satan,"[1] etc.; and he continues in the above words to show that Satan had been cast out, so that the evidence would have been strengthened by the retention of the word in Luke, had he quoted that Gospel. The variations indicate that he quoted from another source.

The next passage pointed out by De Wette likewise finds a parallel only in the third Gospel. It occurs in *Hom.* ix. 22: "Nevertheless, though all demons with all the diseases flee before you, in this only is not to be your rejoicing, but in that, through grace, your names, as of the ever-living, are recorded in heaven." This is compared with Luke x. 20: "Notwithstanding, in this rejoice not that the spirits are subject unto you, but rejoice that your names are written in the heavens."

Hom. ix. 22.	Luke x. 20.
Ἀλλ' ὅμως κἂν πάντες δαίμονες μετὰ πάντων τῶν παθῶν ὑμᾶς φεύγωσιν, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τούτῳ μόνῳ χαίρειν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ δι' εὐαρεστίαν τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ ὡς ἀεὶ ζώντων ἀναγραφῆναι.	Πλὴν ἐν τούτῳ μὴ χαίρετε, ὅτι τὰ πνεύματα ὑμῖν ὑποτάσσεται, χαίρετε δὲ ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

The differences between these two passages are too great, and the peculiarities of the Homily too marked, to require any argument to demonstrate that the quotation cannot be successfully claimed by our third Gospel. On the contrary, as one of so many other passages systematically varying from the canonical Gospels, it must be assigned to another source.

[1] See p. 307.

De Wette says: "A few others (quotations) presuppose (*voraussetzen*) the Gospel of Mark,"[1] and he gives them. The first occurs in *Hom.* ii. 19: "There is a certain Justa[2] amongst us, a Syrophœnician, a Canaanite by race, whose daughter was affected by a sore disease, and who came to our Lord crying out and supplicating that he would heal her daughter. But he, being also asked by us, said: 'It is not meet to heal the Gentiles who are like dogs from their using different meats and practices, whilst the table in the kingdom has been granted to the sons of Israel.' But she, hearing this and exchanging her former manner of life for that of the sons of the kingdom, in order that she might, like a dog, partake of the crumbs falling from the same table, obtained, as she desired, healing for her daughter."[3] This is compared with Mark vii. 24–30,[4] as it is the only Gospel which calls the woman a Syrophœnician. The Homily, however, not only calls her so, but gives her name as "Justa." If, therefore, it be argued that the mention of her nationality supposes that the author found the fact in his Gospel, and because we know no other but Mark[5] which gives that information, that he therefore derived it from our second Gospel, the additional mention of the name of "Justa" on the same grounds necessarily points to the use of a Gospel which likewise contained it, which our Gospel does not. Nothing can be more decided than the variation in language throughout this whole passage from the account in Mark, and the reply of Jesus is quite foreign to our Gospels. In Mark (vii. 25) the daughter has "an unclean spirit" (πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον); in Matthew (xv. 22) she is "grievously possessed by a devil" (κακῶς δαιμονίζεται), but in the Homily she is "affected by a sore disease" (ὑπὸ χαλεπῆς νόσου συνείχετο). The second Gospel knows nothing of any intercession on the part of the disciples, but Matthew has: "And the disciples came and besought him (ἠρώτων αὐτόν), saying: 'Send her away, for she crieth after us,'"[6] whilst the Homily has merely "being also asked by us" (ἀξιωθεὶς), in the sense of intercession in her favour. The second Gospel gives the reply of Jesus as follows: "Let the children first be filled; for it is not meet to take the bread of the children, and to cast it to the dogs. And she answered and said unto him: 'Yea, Lord, for the dogs also eat under the table of the crumbs of the children.' And he said unto her: 'For this saying

[1] *Einl. N. T.*, p. 115.

[2] Cf. *Hom.* iii. 73; xiii. 7.

[3] *Hom.* ii. 19.

[4] Cf. Matt. xv. 21–28.

[5] "The woman was a Greek, a Syrophœnician by nation." (ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἦν Ἑλληνίς, Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει). Mark vii. 26. "A woman of Canaan" (γυνὴ Χαναναία). Matt. xv. 22.

[6] Matt. xv. 23.

go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter.'"[1] The nature of the reply of the woman is, in the Gospels, the reason given for granting her request; but in the Homily the woman's conversion to Judaism,[2] that is to say Judeo-Christianity, is prominently advanced as the cause of her successful pleading. It is certain from the whole character of this passage, the variation of the language, and the reply of Jesus which is not in our Gospels at all, that the narrative cannot rightly be assigned to them; but the more reasonable inference is that it was derived from another source.

The last of De Wette's[3] passages is from *Hom.* iii. 57: "Hear, O Israel; the Lord thy[4] God is one Lord." This is a quotation from Deuteronomy vi. 4, which is likewise quoted in the second Gospel, xii. 29, in reply to the question, "Which is the first Commandment of all? Jesus answered: The first is, Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God," etc. In the Homily, however, the quotation is made in a totally different connection, for there is no question of commandments at all, but a clear statement of the circumstances under which the passage was used, which excludes the idea that this quotation was derived from Mark xii. 29. The context in the Homily is as follows: "But to those who were beguiled to imagine many Gods as the Scriptures say, he said: Hear, O Israel," etc.[5] There is no hint of the assertion of many gods in the Gospels: but, on the contrary, the question is put by one of the scribes in Mark to whom Jesus says: "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God."[6] The quotation, therefore, cannot be legitimately appropriated by the second Synoptic, but may with much greater probability be assigned to a different Gospel.

We may here refer to the passage, the only one pointed out by him in connection with the Synoptics, the discovery of which, Dr. Westcott affirms, "has removed the doubts which had long been raised about those (allusions) to St. Mark."[7] The discovery referred to is that of the *Codex Ottobonianus* by Dressel, which contains the concluding part of the *Homilies*, and which was first published by him in 1853. Dr. Westcott says: "Though St. Mark has few peculiar phrases, one of these is repeated verbally in the concluding part of the 19th Homily."[8] The passage is as follows: *Hom.* xix. 20: "Wherefore also he explained to his disciples privately the mysteries of the kingdom of the heavens."

[1] Mark vii. 27–29. [2] Cf. *Hom.* xiii. 7. [3] *Einl. N. T.*, p. 115.

[4] Although most MSS. have σου in this place, some, as, for instance, that edited by Cotelerius, read ὑμῶν.

[5] *Hom.* iii. 57. [6] Mark xii. 34.

[7] *On the Canon*, p. 251. [8] Cf. *Ib.*, p. 252.

This is compared with Mark iv. 34....."and privately, to his own disciples, he explained all things."

Hom. xix. 20.	Mark iv. 34.
Διὸ καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπέλυε τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας τὰ μυστήρια.	.....κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυεν πάντα.[1]

We have only a few words to add to complete the whole of Dr. Westcott's remarks upon the subject. He adds after the quotation: "This is the only place where ἐπιλύω occurs in the Gospels."[2] We may, however, point out that it occurs also in Acts xix. 39 and 2 Peter i. 20. It is upon the coincidence of this word that Dr. Westcott rests his argument that this passage is a reference to Mark. Nothing, however, could be more untenable than such a conclusion from such an indication. The phrase in the Homily presents a very marked variation from the passage in Mark. The "all things" (πάντα) of the Gospel reads: "The mysteries of the kingdom of the heavens" (τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας τὰ μυστήρια) in the Homily. The passage in Mark iv. 11, to which Dr. Westcott does not refer, reads τὸ μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. There is one very important matter, however, which our apologist has omitted to point out, and which, it seems to us, decides the case—the context in the Homily. The chapter commences thus: "And Peter said: We remember that our Lord and Teacher, as commanding, said to us: 'Guard the mysteries for me, and the sons of my house.' Wherefore, also he explained to his disciples privately," etc.[3]; and then comes our passage. Now, here is a command of Jesus, in immediate connection with which the phrase before us is quoted, which does not appear in our Gospels, and which clearly establishes the use of a different source. The phrase itself, which differs from Mark, as we have seen, may, with all right, be referred to the same unknown Gospel.

It must be borne in mind that all the quotations which we have hitherto examined are those which have been selected as most closely approximating to passages in our Gospels. Space forbids our giving illustrations of the vast number which so much more widely differ from parallel texts in the Synoptics. We shall confine ourselves to pointing out, in the briefest possible manner, some of the passages which are persistent in their variations, or recall similar passages in the Memoirs of Justin. The first of these is the injunction in *Hom.* iii. 55: "Let your yea be yea, your nay

[1] Dr. Westcott quotes this reading, which is supported by the Codices B, C, Sinaiticus, and others. The *Codex Alexandrinus* and a majority of other MSS. read for τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς, "τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ," which is closer to the passage in the Homily. It is fair that this should be pointed out.

[2] *On the Canon*, p. 252, note 1.

[3] *Hom.* xix. 20.

nay, for whatsoever is more than these cometh of the evil one." The same saying is repeated in *Hom.* xix. with the sole addition of "and." We subjoin the Greek of these, together with that of the Gospel and Justin with which the *Homilies* agree :—

Hom. iii. 55.	Ἔστω	ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναί τὸ οὒ οὔ·
Hom. xix. 2.	Ἔστω	ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναί καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ.
Apol., i. 16.	Ἔστω δὲ	ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναί καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ.
Matt. v. 37.	Ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν	ναὶ ναί | οὒ οὔ.

As we have already discussed this passage,[1] we need not repeat our remarks here. That it comes from a source different from our Gospels is rendered still more probable by the quotation in *Hom.* xix. 2 being preceded by another which has no parallel in our Gospels. "And elsewhere he said : 'He who sowed the bad seed is the devil' (Ὁ δὲ τὸ κακὸν σπέρμα σπείρας ἐστὶν ὁ διάβολος[2]) ; and again : 'Give no pretext to the evil one' (Μὴ δότε πρόφασιν τῷ πονηρῷ). But in exhorting he prescribes : 'Let your yea be yea,'" etc. The first of these phrases differs markedly from our Gospels ; the second is not in them at all ; the third, which we are considering, differs likewise in an important degree in common with Justin's quotation, and there is every reason for supposing that the whole were derived from the same unknown source.

In the same Homily (xix. 2) there occurs also a passage which exhibits variations likewise found in Justin, which we have already examined,[3] and now merely point out : "Begone into the darkness without, which the Father hath prepared for the devil and his angels."[4] The quotation in Justin (*Dial.* 76) agrees exactly with this, with the exception that Justin has Σατανᾷ instead of διαβόλῳ, which is not important, whilst the agreement in the marked variation from the parallel in the first Gospel establishes the probability of a common source different from ours.

We have also already[5] referred to the passage in *Hom.* xvii. 4: "No one knew (ἔγνω) the Father but the Son, even as no one knoweth the son but the Father and those to whom the Son is minded to reveal him." This quotation differs from Matt. xi. 27 in form, in language, and in meaning ; but agrees with Justin's reading of the same text, and, as we have shown, the use of the aorist here, and the transposition of the order, were characteristics of the Gospels used by Gnostics and other parties in the early Church ; and the passage, with these variations, was regarded by them as the basis of some of their leading doctrines.[6] That the

[1] P. 226, n. 1, p. 235 f.
[2] Cf. Matt. xiii. 39.
[3] P. 226, n. 4, p. 235 f.
[4] *Hom.* xix. 2 ; cf. Matt. xxv. 41.
[5] P. 252 ff.
[6] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 6, §§ 1, 3, 7 ; cf. p. 254 f.

variation is not accidental, but a deliberate quotation from a written source, is proved by this, and by the circumstance that the author of the *Homilies* repeatedly quotes it elsewhere in the same form.[1] It is unreasonable to suppose that the quotations in these *Homilies* are so systematically and consistently erroneous, and not only can they not, from their actual variations, be legitimately referred to the Synoptics exclusively, but, considering all the circumstances, the only natural conclusion is that they are derived from a source different from our Gospels.

Another passage occurs in *Hom.* iii. 50: "Wherefore ye do err, not knowing the true things of the Scriptures; and on this account ye are ignorant of the power of God." This is compared with Mark xii. 24: "Do ye not therefore err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God?"

Hom. III. 50.	Mark XII. 24.
Διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε, μὴ εἰδότες τὰ ἀληθῆ τῶν γραφῶν. οὗ εἵνεκεν ἀγνοεῖτε τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ.	Οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ;

The very same quotation is made both in *Hom.* ii. 51 and xviii. 20, and in each case in which the passage is introduced it is in connection with the assertion that there are true and false Scriptures, and that, as there are in the Scriptures some true sayings and some false, Jesus, by these words, showed to those who erred by reason of the false the cause of their error. There can scarcely be a doubt that the author of the *Homilies* quotes this passage from a Gospel different from ours, and this is demonstrated by the important variation from our text, by its consistent repetition, and by the context in which it stands.

Upon each occasion, also, that the author of the *Homilies* quotes the foregoing passage he likewise quotes another saying of Jesus which is foreign to our Gospels: "Be ye approved money-changers," γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι.[3] The sentence is thrice quoted without variation, and each time, together with the preceding passage, it refers to the necessity of discrimination between true and false sayings in the Scriptures, as, for instance: "And Peter said: If, therefore, of the Scriptures some are true and some are false, our Teacher rightly said: 'Be ye approved money-changers,' as in the Scriptures there are some approved sayings and some spurious."[4] This is one of the best known of the apocryphal sayings of Jesus, and it is quoted by nearly all the Fathers,[5] by

[1] *Hom.* xviii. 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 20.
[2] Cf. Matt. xxii. 29, which is still more remote.
[3] *Hom.* ii. 51, iii. 50, xviii. 20.
[4] *Hom.* ii. 51.
[5] *Apost. Constit.*, ii. 36; cf. 37; Clem. Al., *Strom.*, i. 28, § 177; cf. ii. 4, § 15, vi. 10, § 81, vii. 15, § 90; Origen, in *Joan. T.* xix., vol. iv., p. 289;

many as from Holy Scripture, and by some ascribed to the Gospel of the Nazarenes, or the Gospel according to the Hebrews. There can be no question here that the author quotes an apocryphal Gospel.

There is, in immediate connection with both the preceding passages, another saying of Jesus quoted which is not found in our Gospels: "Why do ye not discern the good reason of the Scriptures?" "Διὰ τί οὐ νοεῖτε τὸ εὔλογον τῶν γραφῶν."[1] This passage also comes from a Gospel different from ours, and the connection and sequence of these quotations is very significant.

One further illustration and we have done. We find the following in *Hom.* iii. 55: "And to those who think that God tempts, as the Scriptures say, he said: 'The evil one is the tempter,' who also tempted himself."[2] This short saying is not found in our Gospels; it probably occurred in the Gospel of the *Homilies* in connection with the temptation of Jesus. It is not improbable that the writer of the Epistle of James, who shows acquaintance with a Gospel different from ours,[3] also knew this saying.[4] We are here again directed to the Ebionite Gospel. Certainly the quotation is derived from a source different from our Gospels.

These illustrations of the evangelical quotations in the *Clementine Homilies* give but an imperfect impression of the character of the extremely numerous passages which occur in the work. We have selected for our examination the quotations which have been specially cited by critics as closest to parallels in our Gospels, and have thus submitted the question to the test which is most favourable to the claims of our Synoptics. Space forbids our adequately showing the much wider divergence which exists in the great majority of cases between them and the quotations in the *Homilies*. To sum up the case: Out of more than a hundred of these quotations only four brief and fragmentary phrases really agree with parallels in our Synoptics, and these are either not used in the same context as in our Gospels, or are of a nature far from special to them. Of the rest, all without exception vary more or less from our Gospels, and many in their variations agree with similar quotations in other writers, or on repeated quotation always present the same peculiarities, whilst others, professed to be direct quotations of

Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xliv. 2, p. 382; Hieron., *Ep. ad Minerv. et Alex.*, 119 (al. 152); *Comm. in Ep. ad Ephes.*, iv.; Grabe, *Spicil. Patr.*, i., p. 13 f., 326; Cotelerius, *Patr. Ap.*, i., p. 249 f.; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, ii., p. 524.

[1] *Hom.* iii. 50.

[2] Τοῖς δὲ οἰομένοις ὅτι ὁ θεὸς πειράζει, ὡς αἱ Γραφαὶ λέγουσιν ἔφη· Ὁ πονηρός ἐστιν ὁ πειράζων, ὁ καὶ αὐτὸν πειράσας. *Hom.* iii. 55.

[3] Cf. v. 12.

[4] Cf. i. 13.

sayings of Jesus, have no parallels in our Gospels at all. Upon the hypothesis that the author made use of our Gospels, such systematic divergence would be perfectly unintelligible and astounding. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the agreement of a few passages with parallels in our Gospels cannot prove anything. The only extraordinary circumstance is that, even using a totally different source, there should not have been a greater agreement with our Synoptics. But for the universal inaccuracy of the human mind, every important historical saying, having obviously only one distinct original form, would in all truthful histories have been reported in that one unvarying form. The nature of the quotations in the *Clementine Homilies* leads to the inevitable conclusion that their author derived them from a Gospel different from ours ; at least, since the source of these quotations is never named throughout the work, and there is not the faintest direct indication of our Gospels, the *Clementine Homilies* cannot be considered witnesses of any value as to the origin and authenticity of the canonical Gospels. That this can be said of a work written at least a century and a half after the establishment of Christianity, and abounding with quotations of the discourses of Jesus, is in itself singularly suggestive.

It is scarcely necessary to add that the author of the *Homilies* has no idea of any canonical writings but those of the Old Testament, though, even with regard to these, some of our quotations have shown that he held peculiar views, and believed that they contained spurious elements. There is no reference in the *Homilies* to any of the Epistles of the New Testament.

One of the most striking points in this work, on the other hand, is its determined animosity against the Apostle Paul. We have seen that a strong anti-Pauline tendency was exhibited by many of the Fathers, who, like the author of the *Homilies*, made use of Judeo-Christian Gospels different from ours. In this work, however, the antagonism against the "Apostle of the Gentiles" assumes a tone of peculiar virulence. There cannot be a doubt that the Apostle Paul is attacked in it, as the great enemy of the true faith, under the hated name of Simon the Magician, whom Peter follows everywhere for the purpose of unmasking and confuting him. He is robbed of his title of "Apostle of the Gentiles," which, together with the honour of founding the Church of Antioch, of Laodicæa, and of Rome, is ascribed to Peter. All that opposition to Paul which is implied in the Epistle to the Galatians and elsewhere[1] is here realised and exaggerated, and the personal difference with Peter to which Paul refers[2] is widened

[1] 1 Cor. i. 11, 12 ; 2 Cor. xi. 13, 20 f. ; Philip. i. 15, 16.
[2] Gal. ii. 11 ; cf. 1 Cor. i. 11, 12.

into the most bitter animosity. In the Epistle of Peter to James, which is prefixed to the *Homilies*, Peter says, in allusion to Paul: "For some among the Gentiles have rejected my lawful preaching and accepted certain lawless and foolish teaching of the hostile man."[1] First expounding a doctrine of duality, as heaven and earth, day and night, life and death,[2] Peter asserts that in Nature the greater things come first; but amongst men the opposite is the case, and the first is worse, and the second better.[3] He then says to Clement that it is easy, according to this order, to discern to what class Simon (Paul) belongs, "who came before me to the Gentiles; and to which I belong who have come after him, and have followed him as light upon darkness, as knowledge upon ignorance, as health upon disease."[4] He continues: "If he had been known he would not have been believed; but now, not being known, he is wrongly believed; and though by his acts he is a hater, he has been loved; and, although an enemy, he has been welcomed as a friend; and, though he is death, he has been desired as a saviour; and, though fire, esteemed as light; and, though a deceiver, he is listened to as speaking the truth."[5] There is much more of this acrimonious abuse put into the mouth of Peter.[6] The indications that it is Paul who is really attacked under the name of Simon are much too clear to admit of doubt. In *Hom.* xi. 35, Peter, warning the Church against false teachers, says: "He who hath sent us, our Lord and Prophet, declared to us that the evil one.....announced that he would send, from amongst his followers, apostles[7] to deceive. Therefore, above all, remember to avoid every apostle, or teacher, or prophet, who first does not accurately compare his teaching with that of James, called the brother of my Lord, and to whom was confided the ordering of the Church of the Hebrews in Jerusalem," etc., lest this evil one should send a false preacher to them, "as he has sent to us Simon preaching a counterfeit of truth in the name of our Lord and disseminating error."[8] Further on he speaks more plainly still. Simon maintains that he has a truer appreciation of the doctrines and teaching of Jesus, because he has recieved his inspiration by supernatural vision, and not merely by the common experience of the senses,[9] and Peter replies: "If, therefore, our Jesus, indeed, was seen in a vision, was known by thee, and conversed with thee, it was only as one

[1] *Epist. Petri ad Jacobum*, § 2. Dr. Westcott quotes this passage with the observation, "There can be no doubt that St. Paul is referred to as 'the enemy'" (*On the Canon*, p. 252, note 2).

[2] *Hom.* ii. 15. [3] *Ib.*, ii. 16. [4] *Ib.*, ii. 17.

[5] *Ib.*, ii. 18. [6] Cf. *Hom.* iii. 59; vii. 2, 4, 10, 11.

[7] We have already pointed out that this declaration is not in our Gospels.

[8] *Hom.* xi. 35; cf. *Galat.* i. 7 ff. [9] *Ib.*, xvii. 13 ff.

angry with an adversary.....But can anyone, through a vision, be made wise to teach? And if thou sayest 'It is possible,' then, wherefore did the Teacher remain and discourse for a whole year to us who were awake? And how can we believe thy story that he was seen by thee? And how could he have been seen by thee when thy thoughts are contrary to his teaching? But if seen and taught by him for a single hour, thou becamest an apostle[1]—preach his words, interpret his sayings, love his apostles, oppose not me who consorted with him. For thou hast directly withstood me who am a firm rock, the foundation of the Church. If thou hadst not been an adversary, thou wouldst not have calumniated me, thou wouldst not have reviled my teaching, in order that, when declaring what I have myself heard from the Lord, I might not be believed, as though I were condemned.....But if thou callest me condemned, thou speakest against God, who revealed Christ to me,'"[2] etc. This last phrase, "If thou callest me condemned" (Ἤ εἰ κατεγνωσμένον με λέγεις), is an evident allusion to Galat. ii. 11: "I withstood him to the face, because he was condemned" (ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν).

We have digressed to a greater extent than we intended, but it is not unimportant to show the general character and tendency of the work we have been examining. The *Clementine Homilies*—written certainly not earlier than the end of the second century; which never name nor indicate any Gospel as the source of the author's knowledge of evangelical history; whose quotations of sayings of Jesus, numerous as they are, systematically differ from the parallel passages of our Synoptics, or are altogether foreign to them; which denounce the Apostle Paul as an impostor, enemy of the faith, and disseminator of false doctrine, and therefore repudiate his Epistles, at the same time equally ignoring all the other writings of the New Testament—can scarcely be considered as giving much support to any theory of the early formation of the New Testament Canon, or as affording evidence even of the existence of its separate books.

Among the writings which used formally to be ascribed to Justin Martyr, and to be published along with his genuine works, is the short composition commonly known as the "Epistle to Diognetus." The ascription of this composition to Justin arose solely from the fact that in the only known MS. of the letter there is an inscription, Τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς Διόγνητον, which, from its connection, was referred to Justin.[3] The style and contents of the work, however, soon

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 1 ff. "Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" Cf. Galat. i. 1; i. 12, "For neither did I myself receive it by man, nor was I taught it but by revelation of Jesus Christ."

[2] *Hom.* xvii. 19.

[3] Otto, *Ep. ad Diognetum*, etc., 1852, p. 11 f.

convinced critics that it could not possibly have been written by Justin, and although it has been ascribed by various isolated writers to Apollos, Clement, Marcion, Quadratus, and others, none of these guesses have been seriously supported, and critics are almost universally agreed in confessing that the author of the Epistle is entirely unknown.

Such being the case, the difficulty of assigning a date to the work with any degree of certainty is extreme, if it be not absolutely impossible to do so. This difficulty is increased by several circumstances. The first and most important of these is the fact that the Epistle to Diognetus is neither quoted nor mentioned by any ancient writer, and consequently there is no external evidence to indicate the period of its composition. Moreover, it is not only anonymous but incomplete, or, at least, as we have it, not the work of a single writer. At the end of chap. x. a break is indicated, and the two concluding chapters are unmistakably by a different and later hand. It is not singular, therefore, that there exists a wide difference of opinion as to the date of the first ten chapters, although all agree regarding the later composition of the concluding portion. It is assigned by critics to various periods ranging from about the end of the first quarter of the second century to the end of the third century or later, whilst many denounce it as a mere modern forgery. Nothing can be more insecure in one direction than the date of a writing derived alone from internal evidence. Allusions to actual occurrences may with certainty prove that a work could only have been written after they had taken place. The mere absence of later indications in an anonymous Epistle only found in a single MS. of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, however, and which may have been, and probably was, written expressly in imitation of early Christian feeling, cannot furnish any solid basis for an early date. It must be evident that the determination of the date of this Epistle cannot, therefore, be regarded as otherwise than doubtful and arbitrary. It is certain that the purity of its Greek and the elegance of its style distinguish it from all other Christian works of the period to which so many assign it.

The Epistle to Diognetus does not furnish any evidence even of the existence of our Synoptics, for it is admitted that it does not contain a single direct quotation from any evangelical work. We shall hereafter have to refer to this Epistle in connection with the fourth Gospel, but in the meantime it may be well to add that in chap. xii., one of those, it will be remembered, which are admitted to be of later date, a brief quotation is made from 1 Cor. viii. 1, introduced merely by the words, ὁ ἀπόστολος λέγει.

CHAPTER VI.

BASILIDES—VALENTINUS.

We must now turn back to an earlier period, and consider any evidence regarding the synoptic Gospels which may be furnished by the so-called heretical writers of the second century. The first of these who claims our attention is Basilides, the founder of a system of Gnosticism, who lived in Alexandria about the year 125 of our era.[1] With the exception of a very few brief fragments,[2] none of the writings of this Gnostic have been preserved, and all our information regarding them is, therefore, derived at second-hand from ecclesiastical writers opposed to him and his doctrines; and their statements, especially where acquaintance with, and the use of, the New Testament Scriptures are assumed, must be received with very great caution. The uncritical and inaccurate character of the Fathers rendered them peculiarly liable to be misled by foregone devout conclusions.

Eusebius states that Agrippa Castor, who had written a refutation of the doctrines of Basilides, "says that he had composed twenty-four books upon the Gospel."[3] This is interpreted by Tischendorf, without argument, and in a most arbitrary and erroneous manner, to imply that the work was a commentary upon our four canonical Gospels;[4] a conclusion the audacity of which can scarcely be exceeded. This is, however, almost surpassed by the treatment of Dr. Westcott, who writes regarding Basilides: "It appears, moreover, that he himself published a Gospel—a 'Life of Christ,' as it would perhaps be called in our days, or 'The Philosophy of Christianity'[5]—but he admitted the historic truth of all the facts contained in the canonical Gospels, and used them as Scripture. For, in spite of his peculiar opinions, the testimony of Basilides to our 'acknowledged' books is comprehensive and clear. In the few pages of his writings which remain there are certain references to the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John,"[6] etc. Now, such representations as these, made in

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 7, 8, 9.
[2] Grabe, *Spicil. Patr.*, ii., p. 39 ff., 65 ff.
[3] *H. E.*, iv. 7.
[4] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 51 f.
[5] These names are, of course, pure inventions of Dr. Westcott's fancy.
[6] *On the Canon*, p. 255 f. [Since these remarks were first made, Dr. Westcott has somewhat enlarged his account of Basilides, but we still consider that his treatment of the subject is deceptive and incomplete.]

the absence of any explanation of the facts, or any statement of the reasons for such unqualified assertions, and totally ignoring the whole of the discussion with regard to the supposed quotations of Basilides in the work commonly ascribed to Hippolytus, and the adverse results of learned criticism, must be condemned as only calculated to mislead readers unacquainted with the facts of the case.

We know from the evidence of antiquity that Basilides made use of a Gospel, written by himself, it is said, but certainly called after his own name.[1] An attempt has been made to explain this by suggesting that perhaps the work mentioned by Agrippa Castor may have been mistaken for a Gospel; but the fragments of that work which are still extant[2] are of a character which precludes the possibility that any writing of which they formed a part could have been considered a Gospel. Various opinions have been expressed as to the exact nature of the Gospel of Basilides. Neander affirmed it to be the Gospel according to the Hebrews which he brought from Syria to Egypt;[3] whilst Schneckenburger held it to be the Gospel according to the Egyptians.[4] Others believe it to have at least been based upon one or other of these Gospels. There seems most reason for the hypothesis that it was a form of the Gospel according to the Hebrews which was so generally in use.

Returning to the passage already quoted, in which Eusebius states, on the authority of Aggrippa Castor, whose works are no longer extant, that Basilides had composed a work in twenty-four books on the Gospel (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον), and to the unwarrantable inference that this must have been a work on our four Gospels, we must add that, so far from deriving his doctrines from our Gospels or other New Testament writings, or acknowledging their authority, Basilides professed that he received his knowledge of the truth from Glaucias, "the interpreter of Peter," whose disciple he claimed to be,[5] and thus practically sets Gospels aside and prefers tradition. Basilides also claimed to have received from a certain Matthias the report of private discourses which he had heard from the Saviour for his special instruction.[6] Agrippa Castor further stated, according to Eusebius, that in his ἐξηγητικά

[1] *Ausus fuit et Basilides scribere Evangelium et suo illud nomine titulare.* Origen, *Hom. i. in Lucam. Ausus est etiam Basilides Evangelium scribere quod dicitur secundum Basilidem.* Ambros., *Comment. in Luc. Proem.* Hieron., *Præf. in Matt.*

[2] Grabe, *Spicil. Patr.*, ii., p. 39 ff., 65 ff.; Clemens Al., *Strom.*, iv. 12.

[3] *Gnost. Syst.*, p. 84; cf. *K. G.*, 1843, ii., p. 709, anm. 2.

[4] *Ueb. d. Ev. d. Ægypt.*, 1834.

[5] Clem. Al., *Strom.*, vii. 17, § 106.

[6] Hippolytus, *Refut. Omn. Hær.*, vii. 20; ed. Duncker et Schneidewin, 1859.

Basilides named for himself, as prophets, Barcabbas and Barcoph (Parchor[1]), as well as invented others who never existed, and claimed their authority for his doctrines.[2] With regard to all this Dr. Westcott writes: "Since Basilides lived on the verge of the apostolic times, it is not surprising that he made use of other sources of Christian doctrine besides the canonical books. The belief in Divine Inspiration was still fresh and real,"[3] etc. It is apparent, however, that Basilides, in basing his doctrines upon tradition and upon these apocryphal books as inspired, and in having a special Gospel called after his own name, which, therefore, he clearly adopts as the exponent of his ideas of Christian truth, completely ignores the canonical Gospels, and not only does not offer any evidence for their existence, but proves, on the contrary, that he did not recognise any such works as of authority. There is no ground, therefore, for Tischendorf's assumption that the commentary of Basilides "on the Gospel" was written upon our Gospels, but that idea is negatived in the strongest way by all the facts of the case. The perfectly simple interpretation of the statement is that long ago suggested by Valesius,[4] that the Commentary of Basilides was composed upon his own Gospel, whether it was the Gospel according to the Hebrews or the Egyptians.

Moreover, it must be borne in mind that Basilides used the word "Gospel" in a peculiar sense. Hippolytus, in the work usually ascribed to him, writing of the Basilidians and describing their doctrines, says: "When therefore it was necessary, he (?) says, that we, the children of God, should be revealed, in expectation of whose revelation, he says, the creation groaned and travailed, the Gospel came into the world, and passed through every principality and power and dominion, and every name that is named," etc. "The Gospel, therefore, came first from the Sonship, he says, through the Son, sitting by the Archon, to the Archon, and the Archon learnt that he was not the God of all things, but begotten,"[5] etc. "The Gospel, according to them, is the knowledge of supramundane matters,"[6] etc. This may not be very intelligible, but it is sufficient to show that "the Gospel" in a technical sense[7] formed a very important part of the system of Basilides. Now, there is nothing whatever to show that the twenty-four books which he composed "on the Gospel" were not

[1] Isidorus, his son and disciple, wrote a commentary on the prophecy of Parchor (Clem. Al., *Strom.*, vi. 6, § 53), in which he further refers to the "prophecy of Cham."

[2] Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 7.

[3] *On the Canon*, p. 255.

[4] Cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 343, not. m.

[5] *Ib.*, vii. 26; cf. 27, etc.

[6] *Ib.*, vii. 27.

[7] Dr. Westcott admits this technical use of the word, of course (*On the Canon*, p. 255 f., note 4).

in elucidation of the Gospel as technically understood by him, illustrated by extracts from his own special Gospel and from the tradition handed down to him by Glaucias and Matthias.

The emphatic assertion of Dr. Westcott, that Basilides "admitted the historic truth of all the facts contained in the canonical Gospels," is based solely upon the following sentence of the work attributed to Hippolytus: "Jesus, however, was generated according to these (followers of Basilides), as we have already said.[1] But when the generation which has already been declared had taken place, all things regarding the Saviour, according to them, occurred in like manner as they have been written in the Gospel."[2] There are, however, several important points to be borne in mind in reference to this passage. The statement in question is not made in connection with Basilides himself, but distinctly in reference to his followers, of whom there were many in the time of Hippolytus and long after him. It is, moreover, a general observation, the accuracy of which we have no means of testing, and upon the correctness of which there is no special reason to rely. The remark, made at the beginning of the third century, that the followers of Basilides believed that the actual events of the life of Jesus occurred in the way in which they have been written in the Gospels, is no proof that either they or Basilides used or admitted the authority of our Gospels. The exclusive use by any one of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, for instance, would be perfectly consistent with the statement. No one who considers what is known of that Gospel, or who thinks of the use made of it in the first half of the second century by perfectly orthodox Fathers, can doubt this. The passage is, therefore, of no weight as evidence for the use of our Gospels. Dr. Westcott himself admits that in the extant fragments of Isidorus, the son and disciple of Basilides, who "maintained the doctrines of his father," he has "noticed nothing bearing on the books of the New Testament."[3] On the supposition that Basilides actually wrote a Commentary on our Gospels, and used them as Scripture, it is indeed passing strange that we have so little evidence on the point.

We must now examine in detail all of the quotations, and they are few, alleged to show the use of our Gospels; and we shall commence with those of Tischendorf. The first passage which he points out is found in the *Stromata* of Clement of Alexandria. Tischendorf guards himself, in reference to these quotations, by merely speaking of them as "Basilidian" (Basili-

[1] He refers to a mystical account of the incarnation.
[2] Hippolytus, *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vii. 27.
[3] *On the Canon*, p. 257.

dianisch),[1] but it might have been more frank to have stated clearly that Clement distinctly assigns the quotation to the followers of Basilides (*οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Βασιλείδου*),[2] and not to Basilides himself.[3] The supposed quotation, therefore, even if traced to our Gospels, could not prove anything in regard to Basilides. The passage itself, compared with the parallel in Matt. xix. 11, 12, is as follows :—

Strom. iii. 1, § 1.	Matt. xix. 11, 12.
They say the Lord answered : All men cannot receive this saying.	v. 11. But he said unto them : All men cannot receive this saying, but only they to whom it is given.
For there are some who are eunuchs from birth, others by constraint.	v. 12. For there are eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are eunuchs which were made eunuchs by men, etc.
Οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, εἰσὶ γὰρ εὐνοῦχοι, οἱ μὲν ἐκ γενετῆς, οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἀνάγκης.	*Οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, ἀλλ' οἷς δέδοται· εἰσὶν γὰρ εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς ἐγεννήθησαν οὕτως, καὶ εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες εὐνουχίσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κ.τ.λ.*

Now, this passage, in its affinity to, and material variation from, our first Gospel, might be quoted as evidence for the use of another Gospel, but it cannot reasonably be cited as evidence for the use of Matthew. Apologists, in their anxiety to grasp at the faintest analogies as testimony, seem altogether to ignore the history of the creation of written Gospels, and to forget the existence of the *πολλοί* of Luke.

The next passage referred to by Tischendorf[4] is one quoted by Epiphanius,[5] which we subjoin in contrast with the parallel in Matt. vii. 6 :—

Hær., xxiv. 5.	Matt. vii. 6.
And therefore he said : Cast not ye pearls before swine, neither give that which is holy unto dogs.	Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you.
Μὴ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μηδὲ δότε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσί.	*Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσίν, μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, κ.τ.λ.*

Here, again, the variation in order is just what one might have expected from the use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews or a similar work, and there is no indication that the passage did

[1] *Wann Wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 51. [2] *Strom.* iii. 1, § 1.
[3] Dr. Westcott does not refer to this quotation at all.
[4] *Wann Wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 51. [5] *Hær.*, xxiv. 5, p. 72.

not end here, without the continuation of our first Synoptic. What is still more important, although Tischendorf does not mention the fact, nor otherwise hint a doubt than by introducing this quotation also as "Basilidianisch," instead of directly ascribing it to Basilides himself, this passage is not attributed by Epiphanius to that heretic. It is introduced into the section of his work directed against the Basilidians, but he uses, like Clement, the indefinite *φησί*; and as, in dealing with all these heresies, there is continual interchange of reference to the head and the later followers, there is no certainty who is referred to in these quotations, and, in this instance, nothing to indicate that this passage is ascribed to Basilides himself. His name is mentioned in the first line of the first chapter of this "heresy," but not again before this *φησί* occurs in chapter v. Tischendorf does not claim any other quotations.

Dr. Westcott states: "In the few pages of his (Basilides') writings which remain there are certain references to the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke,"[1] etc. One might suppose from this that the "certain" references occurred in actual extracts made from his works, and that the quotations, therefore, appeared set in a context of his own words. This impression is strengthened when we read as an introduction to the instances: "The following examples will be sufficient to show his method of quotation."[2] The fact is, however, that these examples are found in the work of Hippolytus, in an epitome of the views of the school by that writer himself, with nothing more definite than a subjectless *φησί* to indicate who is referred to. The only examples Dr. Westcott can give of these "certain references" to our first and third Synoptics do not show his "method of quotation" to much advantage. The first is not a quotation at all, but a mere reference to the Magi and the Star. "But that everything, he says (*φησί*), has its own seasons, the Saviour sufficiently teaches when he says: .....and the Magi having seen the star,"[3] etc. This, of course, Dr. Westcott considers a reference to Matt. ii. 1, 2, but we need scarcely point out that this falls to the ground instantly if it be admitted, as it must be, that the Star and the Magi may have been mentioned in other Gospels than the first Synoptic. We have already seen, when examining the evidence of Justin, that this is the case. The only quotation asserted to be taken from Luke is the phrase: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee,"[4] which agrees with Luke i. 35. This again is introduced by Hippolytus with another subjectless "he says," and, apart from the uncertainty as

[1] *On the Canon*, p. 256.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 256, note 3.
[3] Hippolytus, *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vii. 27.
[4] *Ib.*, vii. 26.

to who "he" is, this is very unsatisfactory evidence as to the form of the quotation in the original text, for it may easily have been corrected by Hippolytus, consciously or unconsciously, in the course of transfer to his pages. We have already met with this passage as quoted by Justin from a Gospel different from ours.

As we have stated, however, none of the quotations which we have considered are directly referred to Basilides himself, but they are all introduced by the utterly vague expression, "he says" (*φησί*), without any subject accompanying the verb. Now, it is admitted that writers of the time of Hippolytus, and notably Hippolytus himself, made use of the name of the founder of a sect to represent the whole of his school, and applied to him, apparently, quotations taken from unknown and later followers. The passages which he cites, therefore, and which appear to indicate the use of Gospels, instead of being extracted from the works of the founder himself, in all probability were taken from writings of Gnostics of his own time. Dr. Westcott admits the possibility of this, in writing of other early heretics. He says: "The evidence that has been collected from the documents of these primitive sects is necessarily somewhat vague. It would be more satisfactory to know the exact position of their authors, and the precise date of their being composed. It is just possible that Hippolytus made use of writings which were current in his own time without further examination, and transferred to the apostolic age forms of thought and expression which had been the growth of two, or even of three, generations."[1] So much as to the reliance to be placed on the work ascribed to Hippolytus. It is certain, for instance, that, in writing of the sect of Naaseni and Ophites, Hippolytus perpetually quotes passages from the writings of the school, with the indefinite *φησί*,[2] as he likewise does in dealing with the Peratici,[3] and Docetæ,[4] no individual author being named; yet he evidently quotes various writers, passing from one to another without explanation, and making use of the same unvarying *φησί*. In one place,[5] where he has "the Greeks say" (*φασὶν οἱ Ἕλληνες*), he gives, without further indication, a quotation from Pindar.[6] A still more apt instance of his method is that pointed out by Volkmar,[7] where Hippolytus, writing of "Marcion, or some one of his hounds," uses, without further explanation, the subjectless *φησί* to introduce matter from the later followers of Marcion.[8] Now, with regard to Basilides,

[1] *On the Canon*, p. 252. [2] Hippolytus, *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, v. 6 ff.
[3] *Ib.*, v. 16, 17. [4] *Ib.*, viii. 9, 10. [5] *Ib.*, v. 7.
[6] Hippol., *Ref. Omn. Hær. ed Duncker et Schneidewin not. in loc.*, p. 134.
[7] *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1854, p. 108 ff.; *Der Ursprung*, p. 70.
[8] Hippolytus, *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vii. 30.

Hippolytus directly refers not only to the heretic chief, but also to his disciple Isidorus and all their followers[1] (καὶ Ἰσίδωρος καὶ πᾶς ὁ τούτων χορός), and then proceeds to use the indefinite "he says," interspersed with references in the plural to these heretics, exhibiting the same careless method of quotation, and leaving complete uncertainty as to the speaker's identity. On the other hand, it has been demonstrated by Hilgenfeld that the gnosticism ascribed to Basilides by Hippolytus, in connection with these quotations, is of a much later and more developed type than that which Basilides himself held,[2] as shown in the actual fragments of his own writings which are still extant, and as reported by Irenæus,[3] Clement of Alexandria,[4] and the work *Adversus omnes Hæreses*, annexed to the *Præscripto Hæreticorum* of Tertullian, which is considered to be the epitome of an earlier work of Hippolytus. The fact probably is that Hippolytus derived his views of the doctrines of Basilides from the writings of his later followers, and from them made the quotations which are attributed to the founder of the school. In any case there is no ground for referring these quotations with an indefinite φησί to Basilides himself.

Of all this there is not a word from Dr. Westcott,[5] but he ventures to speak of "the testimony of Basilides to our 'acknowledged' books," as "comprehensive and clear."[6] We have seen, however, that the passages referred to have no weight whatever as evidence for the use of our Synoptics. The formulæ (as τὸ εἰρημένον to that compared with Luke i. 35, and ὡς γέγραπται, ἡ γραφή with references compared with some of the Epistles) which accompany these quotations, and to which Dr. Westcott points as an indication that the New Testament writings were already recognised as Holy Scripture,[7] need no special attention, because, as it cannot be shown that the expressions were used by Basilides himself, they do not come into question. If anything were required to complete the evidence that these quotations are not from the works of Basilides himself, but from later writings by his followers, it would be the use of such formulæ, for, as the writings of pseudo-Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Papias, Hegesippus, and others of the Fathers, in several ways positively demonstrate, the New Testament writings were not

[1] Hippolytus, *ib.*, vii. 20; cf. 22.

[2] Hilgenfeld, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1856, p. 86 ff., 786 ff.; *Die jud. Apok.*, 1857, p. 287 ff.; *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1862, p. 452 ff.; 1878, p. 228 ff.

[3] *Adv. Hær.*, i. 24.

[4] *Stromata*, vi. 3.

[5] And very little from Tischendorf. [In the 4th ed. of his work, Dr. Westcott has added some observations regarding these subjectless quotations, but still most inadequately states the case.]

[6] *On the Canon*, p. 256.

[7] *Ib.*, p. 256.

admitted, even amongst orthodox Fathers, to the rank of Holy Scripture until a very much later period.

Much of what has been said with regard to the claim which is laid to Basilides by some apologists as a witness for the Gospels and the existence of a New Testament Canon, and the manner in which that claim is advanced, likewise applies to Valentinus, another Gnostic leader, who, about the year 140, came from Alexandria to Rome, and flourished till about A.D. 160.[1] Very little remains of the writings of this Gnostic, and we gain our only knowledge of them from a few short quotations in the works of Clement of Alexandria, and some doubtful fragments preserved by others. We shall presently have occasion to refer directly to these, and need not here more particularly mention them.

Tischendorf, the self-constituted modern *Defensor fidei*,[2] asserts, with an assurance which can scarcely be characterised otherwise than as an unpardonable calculation upon the ignorance of his readers, that Valentinus used the whole of our four canonical Gospels. To do him full justice, we shall, as much as possible, give his own words; and, although we set aside systematically all discussion regarding the fourth Gospel for separate treatment hereafter, we must, in order to convey the full sense of Dr. Tischendorf's proceeding, commence with a sentence regarding that Gospel. Referring to a statement of Irenæus, that the followers of Valentinus made use of the fourth Gospel, Tischendorf continues: "Hippolytus confirms and completes the statement of Irenæus, for he quotes several expressions of John, which Valentinus employed. This most clearly occurs in the case of John x. 8; for Hippolytus writes: 'Because the prophets and the law, according to the doctine of Valentinus, were only filled with a subordinate and foolish spirit, Valentinus says: On account of this, the Saviour says: All who came before me were thieves and robbers.'"[3] Now this, to begin with, is a practical falsification of the text of the Philosophumena, which reads: "Therefore, all the Prophets and the Law spoke under the influence of the Demiurge, a foolish God, he says, (they

[1] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 4, § 3; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 11.

[2] Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1865, p. 329.

[3] "*Die Angabe des Irenäus bestärkt und vervollständigt Hippolytus, denn er führt einzelne Johanneische Aussprüche an, welche Valentin benutzt hat. Am deutlichsten geschieht dies mit Joh.* x. 8; *denn Hippolytus schreibt: Weil die Propheten und das Gesetz, nach Valentins Lehre, nur von einem untergeordneten und thörichten Geiste erfullt waren, so sagt Valentin: Eben deshalb spricht der Erloser: Alle die vor mir gekommen sind, sind Diebe und Mörder gewesen.*" *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 44.

themselves being) foolish, knowing nothing. On this account, he says, the Saviour saith: All who came before me," etc.[1] There is no mention of the name of Valentinus in the passage, and, as we shall presently show, there is no direct reference in the whole chapter to Valentinus himself. The introduction of his name in this manner into the text, without a word of explanation, is highly reprehensible. It is true that in a note Tischendorf gives a closer translation of the passage, without, however, any explanation; and here again he adds, in parenthesis to the "says he," "namely, Valentinus." Such a note, however, which would probably be unread by a majority of readers, does not rectify the impression conveyed by so positive and emphatic an assertion as is conveyed by the alteration in the text.

Tischendorf continues: "And as the Gospel of John, so also were the other Gospels used by Valentinus. According to the statement of Irenæus (I. 7, § 4), he found the said subordinate spirit which he calls Demiurge, Masterworker, emblematically represented by the Centurion of Capernaum (Matt. viii. 9, Luke vii. 8); in the dead and resuscitated daughter of Jairus, when twelve years old (Luke viii. 41), he recognised a symbol of his 'Wisdom' (Achamoth), the mother of the Masterworker (I. 8, § 2): in like manner, he saw represented in the history of the woman who had suffered twelve years from the bloody issue, and was cured by the Lord (Matt. ix. 20), the sufferings and salvation of his twelfth primitive spirit (Aeon) (I. 3, § 3); the expression of the Lord (Matt. v. 18) on the numerical value of the iota ('the smallest letter') he applied to his ten æons in repose."[2] Now, in every instance where Tischendorf here speaks of Valentinus by the singular "he," Irenæus uses the plural "they," referring not to the original founder of the sect, but to his followers in his own day; and the text is thus again in every instance falsified by the pious zeal of the apologist. In the case of the Centurion: "they say" (λέγουσι) that he is the Demiurge;[3] "they declare" (διηγοῦνται) that the daughter of Jairus is the type of Achamoth;[4] "they say" (λέγουσι) that the apostasy of Judas points to the passion in connection with the twelfth æon, and also the fact that Jesus suffered in the twelfth month after his baptism; for they will have it (βούλονται) that he only preached for one year. The case of the woman with the bloody issue for twelve years, and the power which went forth from the Son to heal her, "they will have to be Horos" (εἶναι δὲ ταύτην τὸν Ὅρον θέλουσιν).[5] In like manner they assert that the ten æons are indicated (σημαίνεσθαι λέγουσι)

[1] Hippolytus, *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vi. 35.
[2] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 44.
[3] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 7, § 4.
[4] *Ib.*, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 8, § 2.
[5] *Ib.*, i. 3, § 3.

by the letter "iota," mentioned in the Saviour's expression, Matt. v. 18.[1] At the end of these and numerous other similar references to this chapter to New Testament expressions and passages, Irenæus says: "Thus they interpret," etc. (ἑρμηνεύουσιν εἰρῆσθαι).[2] The plural "They" is employed throughout.

Tischendorf proceeds to give the answer to his statement which is supposed to be made by objectors. "They say: all that has reference to the Gospel of John was not advanced by Valentinus himself, but by his disciples. And in fact, in Irenæus, 'they—the Valentinians say,' occurs much oftener than 'he—Valentinus—says.' But who is there so sapient as to draw the line between what the master alone says, and that which the disciples state without in the least repeating the master?"[3] Tischendorf solves the difficulty by referring everything indiscriminately to the master. Now, in reply to these observations, we must remark, in the first place, that the admission here made by Tischendorf, that Irenæus much more often uses "they say" than "he says" is still quite disingenuous, inasmuch as invariably, and without exception, Irenæus uses the plural in connection with the texts in question. Secondly, it is quite obvious that a Gnostic writing about A.D. 185 195 was likely to use arguments which were never thought of by a Gnostic writing at the middle of the century. At the end of the century the writings of the New Testament had acquired consideration and authority, and Gnostic writers had therefore a reason to refer to them, and to endeavour to show that they supported their peculiar views, which did not exist at all at the time when Valentinus propounded his system. Tischendorf, however, cannot be allowed the benefit even of such a doubt as he insinuates, as to what belongs to the master and what to the followers. Such doubtful testimony could not establish anything, but it is in point of fact also totally excluded by the statements of Irenæus himself.

In the preface to the first book of his great work, Irenæus clearly states the motives and objects for which he writes. He says: "I considered it necessary, having read the commentaries (ὑπομνήμασι) *of the disciples of Valentinus*, as they call themselves, and having had personal intercourse with some of them and acquired full knowledge of their opinions, to unfold to thee," etc., and he goes on to say that he intends to set forth "the opinions of those who are *now* teaching heresy; I speak particularly of the followers of Ptolemæus, whose system is an offshoot of the school of Valentinus."[4] Nothing could be more explicit

[1] *Ib.*, i. 3, § 2. [2] *Ib.*, i. 3, § 4. [3] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 45.
[4] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær. Præf.*, i., § 2.

than this statement that Irenæus neither intended nor pretended to write upon the works of Valentinus himself, but upon the commentaries of his followers of his own time, with some of whom he had had personal intercourse, and that the system which he intended to attack was that actually being taught in his day by Ptolemæus and his school, the offshoot from Valentinus. All the quotations to which Tischendorf refers are made within a few pages of this explicit declaration. Immediately after the passage about the Centurion, he says, "such is their system" (*τοιαύτης δὲ τῆς ὑποθέσεως αὐτῶν οὔσης*), and three lines below he states that they derive their views from unwritten sources (*ἐξ ἀγράφων ἀναγινώσκοντες*).[1] The first direct reference to Valentinus does not occur until after these quotations, and is for the purpose of showing the variation of opinion of his followers. He says: "Let us now see the uncertain opinions of these heretics, for there are two or three of them, how they do not speak alike of the same things, but contradict one another in facts and names." Then he continues: "For the first of them, Valentinus, having derived his principles from the so-called Gnostic heresy, and adapted them to the peculiar character of his school, declared this," etc.[2] And after a brief description of his system, in which no Scripture allusion occurs, he goes on to compare the views of the rest, and in chap. xii. he returns to Ptolemæus and his followers (*Ὁ Πτολεμαῖος, καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, κ.τ.λ.*).

In the preface to Book II., he again says that he has been exposing the falsity of the followers of Valentinus *(qui sunt a Valentino)*, and will proceed to establish what he has advanced; and everywhere he uses the plural "they," with occasional direct references to the followers of Valentinus *(qui sunt a Valentino)*.[3] The same course is adopted in Book III., the plural being systematically used, and the same distinct definition introduced at intervals.[4] And again, in the preface to Book IV., he recapitulates that the preceding books had been written against these, "*qui sunt a Valentino*" (§ 2). In fact, it would almost be impossible for any writer more frequently and emphatically to show that he is not, as he began by declaring, dealing with the founder of the school himself, but with his followers living and teaching at the time at which he wrote.

Dr. Westcott, with whose system of positively enunciating unsupported and controverted statements we are already acquainted, is only slightly outstripped by the German apologist in his

[1] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 8, § 1.
[2] *Ib.*, i. 11, § 1.
[3] As, for instance, ii. 16, § 4.
[4] For instance, "*Secundum autem eos qui sunt a Valentino*," iii. 11, § 2. "*Secundum autem illos*," § 3; "*ab omnibus illos*," § 3. "*Hi autem qui sunt a Valentino*," etc., § 7, *ib.*, § 9, etc.

misrepresentation of the evidence of Valentinus. It must be stated, however, that, acknowledging, as no doubt he does, that Irenæus never refers to Valentinus himself, Dr. Westcott passes over in complete silence the supposed references upon which Tischendorf relies as his only evidence for the use of the Synoptics by that Gnostic. He, however, makes the following extraordinary statement regarding Valentinus: "The fragments of his writings which remain show the same natural and trustful use of Scripture as other Christian works of the same period; and there is no diversity of character in this respect between the quotations given in Hippolytus and those found in Clement of Alexandria. He cites the Epistle to the Ephesians as 'Scripture,' and refers clearly to the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John, to the Epistles to the Romans,"[1] etc.

We shall now give the passages which he points out in support of these assertions.[2] The first two are said to occur in the *Stromata* of the Alexandrian Clement, who professes to quote the very words of a letter of Valentinus to certain people regarding the passions, which are called by the followers of Basilides "the appendages of the soul." The passage is as follows: "But one only is good, whose presence is the manifestation through the Son, and through Him alone will the heart be enabled to become pure, by the expulsion of every evil spirit from the heart. For many spirits dwelling in it do not allow it to be pure, but each of them, while in diverse parts they riot there in unseemly lusts, performs its own works. And, it seems to me, the heart is somewhat like an inn. For that, also, is both bored and dug into, and often filled with the ordure of men, who abide there in revelry, and bestow not one single thought upon the place, seeing it is the property of another. And in such wise is it with the heart, so long as no thought is given to it, being impure, and the dwelling-place of many demons, but as soon as the alone good Father has visited it, it is sanctified and shines through with light, and the

[1] *On the Canon*, p. 259 f. [In the 4th ed. of his work, published since the above remarks were made, Dr. Westcott has modified or withdrawn his assertions regarding Valentinus. As we cannot well omit the above passage, it is right to state that the lines quoted now read: "The few unquestionable fragments of Valentinus contain but little which points to passages of Scripture. If it were clear that the anonymous quotations in Hippolytus were derived from Valentinus himself, the list would be much enlarged, and include a citation of the Epistle to the Ephesians as 'Scripture,' and clear references to the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John, to 1 Corinthians, perhaps also to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the first Epistle of St. John" (p. 295 f.). In a note he adds: "But a fresh and careful examination of the whole section of Hippolytus makes me feel that the evidence is so uncertain that I cannot be sure in this case, as in the case of Basilides, that Hippolytus is quoting the words of the Founder" (p. 295, n. 5). Under these circumstances, the statements even in the amended edition present many curious features.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 260, note 2.

possessor of such a heart becomes so blessed that he shall see God."[1] According to Dr. Westcott, this passage contains two of the "clear references" to our Gospels upon which he bases his statement –namely, to Matt. v. 8 and to Matt. xix. 17.

Now, it is clear that there is no actual quotation from any evangelical work in this passage from the Epistle of Valentinus, and the utmost for which the most zealous apologist could contend is that there is a slight similarity with some words in the Gospel, and Dr. Westcott himself does not venture to call them more than "references." That such distant coincidences should be quoted as evidence for the use of the first Gospel shows how weak is his case. At best such vague allusions could not prove anything; but when the passages to which reference is supposed to be made are examined, it will be apparent that nothing could be more unfounded or arbitrary than the claim of reference specially to our Gospel, to the exclusion of other Gospels then existing, which, to our knowledge, contained both passages. We may, indeed, go still further, and affirm that, if these coincidences are references to any Gospel at all, that Gospel is not the canonical, but one different from it.

The first reference alluded to consists of the following two phrases: "But one only is good (εἷς δέ ἐστιν ἀγαθός) .....the alone good Father" (ὁ μόνος ἀγαθὸς πατήρ). This is compared with Matt. xix. 17[2]: "Why askest thou me concerning good? there is one that is good" (εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθός).[3] Now, the passage in the epistle, if a reference to any parallel episode, such as Matt. xix. 17, indicates, with certainty, the reading: "One is good, the Father" (εἷς ἐστιν ἀγαθὸς ὁ πατήρ). There is no such reading in any of our Gospels. But, although this reading does not exist in any of the canonical Gospels, it is well known that it did exist in uncanonical Gospels no longer extant, and that the passage was one upon which various sects of so-called heretics laid great stress. Irenæus quotes it as one of the texts to which the Marcosians, who made use of apocryphal Gospels,[4] and notably of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, gave a different colouring: εἷς ἐστιν ἀγαθὸς, ὁ πατήρ[5]. Epiphanius also quotes this reading as one of the variations of the Marcionites: εἷς ἐστιν ἀγαθὸς, ὁ θεὸς, ὁ πατήρ.[6] Origen likewise remarks that this passage is misused by some heretics: "*Velut proprie sibi*

[1] Clem., Al. *Strom.*, ii. 20, § 114.
[2] Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 260, note 2.
[3] Mark x. 18 and Luke xviii. 18 are linguistically more distant. "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but God only." οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός.
[4] *Adv. Hær.*, i. 20, § 1. [5] *Ib.*, i. 20, § 2.
[6] Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xlii.; *Schol. L. ea. Pet.*, p. 339.

datum scutum putant (hæretici) quod dixit Dominus in Evangelio : Nemo bonus nisi unus Deus pater."[1] Justin Martyr quotes the same reading from a source different from our Gospels, εἷς ἐστιν ἀγαθὸς ὁ πατήρ μου, κ.τ.λ.,[2] and in agreement with the repeated similar readings of the *Clementine Homilies*, which likewise derived it from an extra canonical source, ὁ γὰρ ἀγαθὸς εἷς ἐστιν, ὁ πατήρ.[3] The use of a similar expression by Clement of Alexandria,[4] as well as by Origen, only serves to prove the existence of the reading in extinct Gospels, although it is not found in any MS. of any of our Gospels.

The second of the supposed references is more diffuse : "One is good, and through him alone will the heart be enabled to become pure (ἡ καρδία καθαρὰ γενέσθαι).....but when the alone good Father has visited it, it is sanctified and shines through with light, and the possessor of such a heart becomes so blessed that he shall see God" (καὶ οὕτω μακαρίζεται ὁ ἔχων τὴν τοιαύτην καρδίαν, ὅτι ὄψεται τὸν θεόν). This is compared[5] with Matt. v. 8 : "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται). It might be argued that this is quite as much a reference to Psalm xxiv. 3–6 as to Matt. v. 8; but even if treated as a reference to the Sermon on the Mount, nothing is more certain than the fact that this discourse had its place in much older forms of the Gospel than our present canonical Gospels, and that it formed part of the Gospel according to the Hebrews and other evangelical writings in circulation in the early Church. Such a reference as this is absolutely worthless as evidence of special acquaintance with our first Synoptic.[6]

Tischendorf does not appeal at all to these supposed references contained in the passages preserved by Clement, but both the German and the English apologist join in relying upon the testimony of Hippolytus,[7] with regard to the use of the Gospels

[1] *De Principiis*, i. 2, § 13; cf. *de Orat.*, 15; *Exhort. ad Mart.*, 7; *Contra Cels.*, v. 11; cf. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.*, ii., pp. 305, 349, 388.

[2] *Apol.*, i. 16. [3] *Hom.*, xviii. 1, 3.

[4] οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ μου, κ.τ.λ. (*Pædag.*, i. 8, § 72, cf. § 74); εἷς ἀγαθὸς ὁ πατήρ (*Strom.*, v. 10, § 64).

[5] Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 260, note 2.

[6] The supposed reference to the Ep. to the Romans i. 20; cf. Clem. Al., *Strom.*, iv. 13, §§ 91, 92, is much more distant than either of the preceding. It is not necessary for us to discuss it; but, as Dr. Westcott merely gives references to all of the passages without quoting any of the words, a good strong assertion becomes a powerful argument, since few readers have the means of verifying its correctness.

[7] By a misprint, Dr. Westcott ascribes all his references of Valentinus to the N. T., except three, to the extracts from his writings in the *Stromata* of Clement, although he should have indicated the work of Hippolytus. Cf. *On the Canon*, 1866, p. 260, note 2.

by Valentinus, although it must be admitted that the former does so with greater fairness of treatment than Dr. Westcott. Tischendorf does refer to, and admit, some of the difficulties of the case, as we shall presently see, whilst Dr. Westcott, as in the case of Basilides, boldly makes his assertion, and totally ignores all adverse facts. The only Gospel reference which can be adduced even in the *Philosophumena*, exclusive of one asserted to be to the fourth Gospel, which will be separately considered hereafter, is advanced by Dr. Westcott, for Tischendorf does not refer to it. The passage is the same as one also imputed to Basilides: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee"; which happens to agree with the words in Luke i. 35; but, as we have seen in connection with Justin, there is good reason for concluding that the narrative to which it belongs was contained in other Gospels. In this instance, however, the quotation is carried further and presents an important variation from the text of Luke. "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore the thing begotten of thee shall be called holy"[1] (*διὸ τὸ γεννώμενον ἐκ σοῦ ἅγιον κληθήσεται*). The reading of Luke is: "Therefore also the holy thing begotten shall be called the Son of God" (*διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ*). It is probable that the passage referred to in connection with the followers of Basilides may have ended in the same way as this, and been derived from the same source. Nothing can be clearer than the fact that this quotation is not taken from our third Synoptic, inasmuch as there does not exist a single MS. which contains such a passage.

We again come to the question: Who really made the quotations which Hippolytus introduces so indefinitely? We have already, in speaking of Basilides, pointed out the loose manner in which Hippolytus and other early writers, in dealing with different schools of heretics, indifferently quote the founder or his followers without indicating the precise person referred to. This practice is particularly apparent in the work of Hippolytus when the followers of Valentinus are in question. Tischendorf himself is obliged to admit this. He asks: "Even though it be also incontestable that the author (Hippolytus) does not always sharply distinguish between the sect and the founder of the sect, does this apply to the present case?"[2] He denies that it does in the instance to which he refers, but he admits the general fact. In the same way, another apologist, speaking of the fourth Gospel (and, as the use of that Gospel is maintained in consequence of a quotation in

[1] Hippolytus, *Adv. Hær.*, vi. 35. [2] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 46.

the very same chapter as we are now considering, only a few lines higher up, both the third and fourth are in the same position) is forced to admit: "The use of the Gospel of John by Valentinus cannot so certainly be proved from our refutation-writing (the work of Hippolytus). Certainly, in the statement of these doctrines it gives abstracts, which contain an expression of John (x. 8), and there cannot be any doubt that this is taken from some writing of the sect. But the apologist, in his expressions regarding the Valentinian doctrines, does not not seem to confine himself to one and the same work, but to have alternately made use of different writings of the school, for which reason we cannot say anything as to the age of this quotation; and from this testimony, therefore, we merely have further confirmation that the Gospel was early[1] (?) used in the School of the Valentinians,"[2] etc. Of all this not a word from Dr. Westcott, who adheres to his system of bare assertion.

Now, we have already quoted[3] the opening sentence of Book VI. 35 of the work ascribed to Hippolytus, in which the quotation from John x. 8, referred to above, occurs; and ten lines further on, with another intermediate, and equally indefinite, "he says" (*φησί*), occurs the supposed quotation from Luke i. 35, which, equally with that from the fourth Gospel, must, according to Weizsäcker, be abandoned as a quotation which can fairly be ascribed to Valentinus himself, whose name is not once mentioned in the whole chapter. A few lines below the quotation, however, a passage occurs which throws much light upon the question. After explaining the views of the Valentinians regarding the verse, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee," etc., the writer thus proceeds: "Regarding this there is among them (*αὐτοῖς*) a great question, a cause both of schism and dissension. And hence their (*αὐτῶν*) teaching has become divided, and the one teaching, according to them (*κατ' αὐτούς*), is called Eastern (*ἀνατολική*), and the other Italian. They from Italy, of whom is Heracleon and Ptolemæus, say (*φασί*) that the body of Jesus was animal, and, on account of this, on the occasion of the baptism, the Holy Spirit, like a dove, came down—that is, the Logos from the Mother above, Sophia—and became joined to the animal, and raised him from the dead. This, *he says* (*φησί*), is the declaration (*τὸ εἰρημένον*)"—and here, be it observed, we come to another of the "clear references" which Dr. Westcott ventures, deliberately and without a word of doubt, to attribute to Valentinus himself[4]—

[1] Why "early"? since Hippolytus writes about A.D. 225.

[2] Weizsäcker, *Unters. üb. d. evang. Gesch.*, 1864, p. 234; cf. Luthardt, *Der johann. Urspr. viert. Ev.*, 1874, p. 88 f.

[3] P. 330, "Therefore all the Prophets," etc.

[4] *On the Canon*, p. 260. [He no longer does so, see back p. 334, n. 1.]

"This, he says, is the declaration: 'He who raised Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies,'[1] that is animal. For the earth has come under a curse: 'For dust, he says (*φησί*), thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.'[2] On the other hand, those from the East (*οἱ δ' αὖ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς*), of whom is Axionicus and Bardesanes, say (*λέγουσιν*) that the body of the Saviour was spiritual, for the Holy Spirit came upon Mary, that is the Sophia and the power of the Highest,"[3] etc.

In this passage we have a good illustration of the mode in which the writer introduces his quotations with the subjectless "he says." Here he is conveying the divergent opinions of the two parties of Valentinians, and explaining the peculiar doctrines of the Italian school "of whom is Heracleon and Ptolemæus," and he suddenly departs from the plural "they" to quote the passage from Romans viii. 11, in support of their views, with the singular "he says." Nothing can be more obvious than that "he" cannot possibly be Valentinus himself, for the schism is represented as taking place amongst his followers, and the quotation is evidently made by one of them to support the views of his party in the schism; but whether Hippolytus is quoting from Heracleon or Ptolemæus, or some other of the Italian[4] school, there is no means of knowing. Of all this, again, nothing is said by Dr. Westcott, who quietly asserts, without hesitation or argument, that Valentinus himself is the person who here makes the quotation.

We have already said that the name of Valentinus does not occur once in the whole chapter (vi. 35) which we have been examining and, if we turn back, we find that the preceding context confirms the result at which we have arrived, that the *φησί* has no reference to the Founder himself, but is applicable only to some later member of his school, most probably contemporary with Hippolytus. In vi. 21, Hippolytus discusses the heresy of Valentinus, which he traces to Pythagoras and Plato; but in ch. 29 he passes from direct reference to the Founder to deal entirely with his school. This is so manifest that the learned editors of the work of Hippolytus, Professors Duncker and Schneidewin, alter the preceding heading at that part from "Valentinus" to "Valentiniani." At the beginning of ch. 29 Hippolytus writes: "Valentinus, therefore, and Heracleon and Ptolemæus and the whole school of these (heretics).....have laid down, as the fundamental principle of their teaching, the arithmetical system. For,

[1] Cf. Rom. viii. 11. [2] Cf. Gen. iii. 19.

[3] Hippolytus, *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vi. 35.

[4] The quotation from an Epistle to the Romans by the Italian school is appropriate.

according to these," etc. And a few lines lower down, "There is discernible amongst them, however, considerable difference of opinion. For many of them, in order that the Pythagorean doctrine of Valentinus may be wholly pure, suppose, etc., but others," etc. He shortly after says that he will proceed to state their doctrines as they themselves teach them (*μνημονεύσαντες ὡς ἐκεῖνοι διδάσκουσιν ἐροῦμεν*). He then continues: "There is, he says (*φησί*)," etc., quoting evidently one of these followers who want to keep the doctrine of Valentinus pure, or of the "others," although without naming him, and three lines further on again, without any preparation, returning to the plural "they say" (*λέγουσιν*), and so on through the following chapters, "he says" alternating with the plural, as the author apparently has in view something said by individuals, or merely expresses general views. In the chapter (34) preceding that which we have principally been examining, Hippolytus begins by referring to "the Quaternion according to Valentinus"; but after five lines on it he continues: "This is what they say: *ταῦτά ἐστιν ἃ λέγουσιν*,"[1] and then goes on to speak of "their whole teaching" (*τὴν πᾶσαν αὐτῶν διδασκαλίαν*), and lower down he distinctly sets himself to discuss the opinions of the school in the plural: "Thus these (Valentinians) subdivide the contents of the Pleroma," etc. (*οὕτως οὗτοι, κ.τ.λ.*), and continues, with an occasional "according to them" (*κατ' αὐτούς*), until, without any name being mentioned, he makes use of the indefinite "he says" to introduce the quotation referred to by Dr. Westcott as a citation by Valentinus himself of "the Epistle to the Ephesians as Scripture."[2] "This is, he says, what is written in Scripture," and there follows a quotation which, it may merely be mentioned, as Dr. Westcott says nothing of it, differs considerably from the passage in the Epistle iii. 14–18. Immediately after, another of Dr. Westcott's quotations from 1 Cor. ii. 14 is given, with the same indefinite "he says," and, in the same way, without further mention of names, the quotations in ch. 35 compared with John x. 8 and Luke i. 35. There is, therefore, absolutely no ground for referring the *φησί* to Valentinus himself; but, on the contrary, Hippolytus shows, in the clearest way, that he is discussing the views of the later writers of the sect, and it is one of these, and not the Founder himself, whom he thus quotes.

We have been forced by these bald and unsupported assertions of apologists to go at such length into these questions, at the risk of being very wearisome to our readers; but it has been our aim as much as possible to make no statements without placing before those who are interested the materials for forming an intelligent

[1] vi. 34. [2] *On the Canon*, p. 260.

opinion. Any other course would be to meet such assertion by mere denial, and it is only by bold and unsubstantiated statements, which have been simply and in good faith accepted by ordinary readers who have not the opportunity, if they have even the will, to test their veracity, that apologists have so long held their ground. Our results regarding Valentinus so far may be stated as follows: the quotations which are so positively imputed to Valentinus are not made by him, but by later writers of his school; and, moreover, the passages which are indicated by the English apologist as references to our two synoptic Gospels not only do not emanate from Valentinus, but do not agree with our Gospels, and are apparently derived from other sources.

The remarks of Dr. Westcott with regard to the connection of Valentinus with our New Testament are on a par with the rest of his assertions. He says: "There is no reason to suppose that Valentinus differed from Catholic writers on the Canon of the New Testament."[1] We might ironically adopt this sentence, for as no writer of the time of Valentinus recognised any New Testament Canon at all, he certainly did not in this respect differ from the other writers of that period. Dr. Westcott relies upon the statement of Tertullian, but even here, although he quotes the Latin passage in a note, he does not fully give its real sense in his text. He writes in immediate continuation of the quotation given above: "Tertullian says that in this he differed from Marcion, that he at least professed to accept 'the whole instrument,' perverting the interpretation, where Marcion mutilated the text." Now, the assertion of Tertullian has a very important modification, which, to anyone acquainted with the very unscrupulous boldness of the "Great African" in dealing with religious controversy, is extremely significant. He does not make the assertion positively and of his own knowledge, but modifies it by saying: "Nor, indeed, if Valentinus seems to use the whole instrument (*neque enim si Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur*),"[2] etc. Tertullian evidently knew very little of Valentinus himself, and had probably not read his writings at all. His treatise against the Valentinians is avowedly not original, but, as he himself admits, is compiled from the writings of Justin, Miltiades, Irenæus, and Proclus.[3] Tertullian would not have hesitated to affirm anything of this kind positively, had there been any ground for it; but his assertion is at once too uncertain, and the value of his statements of this nature much too small, for such

[1] *On the Canon*, p. 259. [Dr. Westcott omits these words from his 4th ed., but he uses others here and elsewhere which imply very nearly the same assertion.]

[2] *De Præscrip. Hær.*, 38.

[3] *Adv. Valent.*, 5.

a remark to have any weight as evidence. Besides, by his own showing, Valentinus altered Scripture (*sine dubio emendans*),[1] which he could not have done had he recognised it as of canonical authority. We cannot, however, place any reliance upon criticism emanating from Tertullian.

All that Origen seems to know on this subject is that the followers of Valentinus (*τοὺς ἀπὸ Οὐαλεντίνου*) have altered the form of the Gospel (*μεταχαράξαντες τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*).[2] Clement of Alexandria, however, informs us that Valentinus, like Basilides, professed to have direct traditions from the Apostles, his teacher being Theodas, a disciple of the Apostle Paul.[3] If he had known any Gospels which he believed to have apostolic authority, there would clearly not have been any need of such tradition. Hippolytus distinctly affirms that Valentinus derived his system from Pythagoras and Plato, and "not from the Gospels" (*οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελίων*), and that consequently he might more properly be considered a Pythagorean and Platonist than a Christian.[4] Irenæus, in like manner, asserts that the Valentinians derive their views from unwritten sources (*ἐξ ἀγράφων ἀναγινώσκοντες*),[5] and he accuses them of rejecting the Gospels, for, after enumerating them,[6] he continues: "When, indeed, they are refuted out of the Scriptures, they turn round in accusation of these same Scriptures, as though they were not correct, nor of authority.....For (they say) that it (the truth) was not conveyed by written records, but by the living voice."[7] In the same chapter he goes on to show that the Valentinians not only reject the authority of Scripture, but also reject ecclesiastical tradition. He says: "But, again, when we refer them to that tradition which is from the Apostles, which has been preserved through a succession of Presbyters in the Churches, they are opposed to tradition, affirming themselves wiser not only than Presbyters, but even than the Apostles, in that they have discovered the uncorrupted truth. For (they say) the Apostles mixed up matters which are of the law with the words of the Saviour, etc.....It comes to this, they neither consent to Scripture nor to tradition. *(Evenit itaque, neque Scripturis jam, neque Traditioni consentire eos.)*"[8] We find, therefore, that even in the time of Irenæus the Valentinians rejected the writings of the New Testament as authoritative

[1] *De Præscrip. Hær.*, 30.
[2] *Strom.*, vii. 17, § 106.
[3] *Adv. Hær.*, i. 8, § 1.
[4] *Contra Cels.*, ii. 27.
[5] *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vi. 29; cf. vi. 21.
[6] *Ib.*, iii. 1, § 1.
[7] *Cum enim ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum, quasi non recte habeant, neque sint ex auctoritate.....Non enim per litteras traditam illam, sed per vivam vocem, etc.* (Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 2, § 1).
[8] *Ib.*, iii. 2, § 2.

documents, which they certainly would not have done had the Founder of their sect himself acknowledged them. So far from this being the case, there was absolutely no New Testament Canon for Valentinus himself to deal with, and his perfectly orthodox contemporaries recognised no other Holy Scriptures than those of the Old Testament.

Irenæus goes still further, and states that the Valentinians of his time not only had many Gospels, but that they possessed one peculiar to themselves. "Those indeed who are followers of Valentinus," he says, "again passing beyond all fear, and putting forth their own compositions, boast that they have more Gospels than there actually are. Indeed, they have proceeded so far in audacity that they entitle their not long written work, agreeing in nothing with the Gospels of the Apostles, the Gospel of Truth, so that there cannot be any Gospel among them without blasphemy."[1] It follows clearly, from the very name of the Valentinian Gospel, that they did not consider that others contained the truth, and indeed Irenæus himself perceived this, for he continues: "For if what is published by them be the Gospel of Truth, yet is dissimilar from those which have been delivered to us by the Apostles, any may perceive who please, as is demonstrated by these very Scriptures, that that which has been handed down from the Apostles is not the Gospel of Truth."[2] These passages speak for themselves. It has been suggested that the "Gospel of Truth" was a harmony of the four Gospels.[3] This cannot by any possibility have been the case, inasmuch as Irenæus distinctly says that it did not agree in anything with the Gospels of the Apostles. We have been compelled to devote too much space to Valentinus, and we now leave him with the certainty that in nothing does he afford any evidence even of the existence of our synoptic Gospels.

[1] *Hi vero, qui sunt a Valentino, iterum exsistentes extra omnem timorem, suas conscriptiones proferentes, plura habere gloriantur, quam sint ipsa Evangelia. Siquidem in tantum processerunt audaciæ, uti quod ab his non olim conscriptum est, veritatis Evangelium titulent, in nihilo conveniens apostolorum Evangeliis, ut nec Evangelium quidem sit apud eos sine blasphemia* (Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 11, § 9).

[2] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 11, § 9.

[3] Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 638.

CHAPTER VII.

MARCION

We must now turn to the great Heresiarch of the second century, Marcion, and consider the evidence regarding our Gospels which may be derived from what we know of him. The importance, and at the same time the difficulty, of arriving at a just conclusion from the materials within our reach have rendered Marcion's Gospel the object of very elaborate criticism, and the discussion of its actual character has continued with fluctuating results for nearly a century.

Marcion was born at Sinope, in Pontus, of which place his father was Bishop,[1] and although it is said that he aspired to the first place in the Church of Rome,[2] the Presbyters refused him communion on account of his peculiar views of Christianity. We shall presently more fully refer to his opinions, but here it will be sufficient to say that he objected to what he considered the debasement of true Christianity by Jewish elements, and he upheld the teaching of Paul alone, in opposition to that of all the other Apostles, whom he accused of mixing up matters of the law with the Gospel of Christ, and falsifying Christianity,[3] as Paul himself had protested.[4] He came to Rome about A.D. 139–142, and continued teaching for some twenty years. His high personal character and elevated views produced a powerful effect upon his time, and, although during his own lifetime and long afterwards vehemently and with every opprobrious epithet denounced by ecclesiastical writers, his opinions were so widely adopted that, in the time of Epiphanius, his followers were to be found throughout the whole world.[5]

Marcion is said to have recognised as his sources of Christian doctrine, besides tradition, a single Gospel and ten Epistles of Paul, which in his collection stood in the following order:—Epistle to Galatians, Corinthians (2), Romans, Thessalonians (2), Ephesians (which he had with the superscription "to the

[1] Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xlii. 1, ed. *Petav.*, p. 302.
[2] Epiph., *Hær.*, xlii. 1.
[3] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 2, § 2; cf. 12, § 12; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 2, 3; cf. i. 20; Origen, *in Joann.* v., § 4.
[4] Gal. i. 6 ff.; cf. ii. 4 ff., 11 ff.; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 1 ff.
[5] Epiph., *Hær.*, xlii. 1.

Laodiceans"),[1] Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon.[2] None of the other books which now form part of the canonical New Testament were either mentioned or recognised by Marcion. This is the oldest collection of Apostolic writings of which there is any trace, but there was at that time no other "Holy Scripture" than the Old Testament, and no New Testament Canon had yet been imagined. Marcion neither claimed canonical authority for these writings, nor did he associate with them any idea of divine inspiration. We have already seen the animosity expressed by contemporaries of Marcion against the Apostle Paul.

Before proceeding to a closer examination of Marcion's Gospel and the general evidence bearing upon it, it may be well here briefly to refer to the system of the Heresiarch, whose high personal character exerted so powerful an influence upon his own time, and whose views continued to prevail widely for a couple of centuries after his death. It was the misfortune of Marcion to live in an age when Christianity had passed out of the pure morality of its infancy, when, untroubled by complicated questions of dogma, simple faith and pious enthusiasm had been the one great bond of Christian brotherhood, into a phase of ecclesiastical development in which religion was fast degenerating into theology, and complicated doctrines were rapidly assuming that rampant attitude which led to so much bitterness, persecution, and schism. In later times Marcion might have been honoured as a reformer; in his own he was denounced as a heretic. Austere and ascetic in his opinions, he aimed at superhuman purity; and although his clerical adversaries might scoff at his impracticable doctrines regarding marriage and the subjugation of the flesh, they have had their parallels amongst those whom the Church has since most delighted to honour, and at least the whole tendency of his system was markedly towards the side of virtue.[3] It would, of course, be foreign to our purpose to enter upon any detailed statement of its principles, and we must confine ourselves to such particulars only as are necessary to an understanding of the question before us.

As we have already frequently had occasion to mention, there were two broad parties in the primitive Church, and the very existence of Christianity was in one sense endangered by the national exclusiveness of the people amongst whom it originated.

[1] Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, v. 11, 17; Epiph., *Hær.*, xlii. 9; cf. 10, *Schol.* xl.

[2] Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, v.; Epiph., *Hær.*, xlii. 9. (Epiphanius transposes the order of the last two Epistles.)

[3] Gfrörer, *Allg. K. G.*, i., p. 134 f; Hagenbach, *K. G.*, 1869, i., p. 134 f.; Hug, *Einl. N. T.*, i., p. 56 ff.; Milman, *Hist. of Chr.*, 1867, ii., p. 77 ff.; Neander, *Allg. K. G.*, ii., p. 791 ff.; Volkmar, *Das Ev. Marc.*, p. 25 ff.

The one party considered Christianity a mere continuation of the Law, and dwarfed it into an Israelitish institution, a narrow sect of Judaism; the other represented the glad tidings as the introduction of a new system applicable to all, and supplanting the Mosaic dispensation of the Law by a universal dispensation of grace. These two parties were popularly represented in the early Church by the two Apostles Peter and Paul, and their antagonism is faintly revealed in the Epistle to the Galatians. Marcion, a gentile Christian, appreciating the true character of the new religion and its elevated spirituality, and profoundly impressed by the comparatively degraded and anthropomorphic features of Judaism, drew a very sharp line of demarcation between them, and represented Christianity as an entirely new and separate system, abrogating the old and having absolutely no connection with it. Jesus was not to him the Messiah of the Jews, the son of David come permanently to establish the Law and the Prophets, but a divine being sent to reveal to man a wholly new spiritual religion, and a hitherto unknown God of goodness and grace. The Creator (*Δημιουργός*), the God of the Old Testament, was different from the God of Grace who had sent Jesus to reveal the Truth, to bring reconciliation and salvation to all, and to abrogate the Jewish God of the World and of the Law, who was opposed to the God and Father of Jesus Christ as Matter is to Spirit, impurity to purity. Christianity was in distinct antagonism to Judaism; the spiritual God of heaven, whose goodness and love were for the Universe, to the God of the World, whose chosen and peculiar people were the Jews; the Gospel of Grace to the dispensation of the Old Testament. Christianity, therefore, must be kept pure from the Judaistic elements humanly thrust into it, which were so essentially opposed to its whole spirit.

Marcion wrote a work called "Antitheses" (*Ἀντιθέσεις*), in which he contrasted the old system with the new, the God of the one with the God of the other, the Law with the Gospel, and in this he maintained opinions which anticipated many held in our own time. Tertullian attacks this work in the first three books of his treatise against Marcion, and he enters upon the discussion of its details with true theological vigour: "Now, then, ye hounds, yelping at the God of truth, whom the Apostle casts out,[1] to all your questions! These are the bones of contention which ye gnaw!"[2] The poverty of the "Great African's" arguments keeps pace with his abuse. Marcion objected: If the God of the Old

[1] Rev. xxii. 15.

[2] *Jam hinc ad quæstiones omnes, canes, quos foras apostolus expellit, latrantes in deum veritatis. Hæc sunt argumentationum ossa, quæ obroditis* (*Adv. Marc.*, ii. 5).

Testament be good, prescient of the future, and able to avert evil, why did he allow man, made in his own image, to be deceived by the devil, and to fall from obedience of the Law into sin and death?[1] How came the devil, the origin of lying and deceit, to be made at all?[2] After the fall, God became a judge both severe and cruel: woman is at once condemned to bring forth in sorrow and to serve her husband, changed from a help into a slave; the earth is cursed which before was blessed, and man is doomed to labour and to death.[3] The law was one of retaliation and not of justice—*lex talionis*—eye for eye, tooth for tooth, stripe for stripe.[4] And it was not consistent, for, in contravention of the Decalogue, God is made to instigate the Israelites to spoil the Egyptians, and fraudulently rob them of their gold and silver;[5] to incite them to work on the Sabbath by ordering them to carry the ark for eight days round Jericho;[6] to break the second commandment by making and setting up the brazen serpent and the golden cherubim.[7] Then God is inconstant, electing men, as Saul and Solomon, whom he subsequently rejects;[8] repenting that he had set up Saul, and that he had doomed the Ninevites,[9] and so on. God calls out: Adam, where art thou? inquires whether he had eaten the forbidden fruit, asks of Cain where his brother was, as if he had not yet heard the blood of Abel crying from the ground, and did not already know all these things.[10] Anticipating the results of modern criticism, Marcion denies the applicability to Jesus of the so-called Messianic prophecies. The Emmanuel of Isaiah (vii. 14, cf. viii. 4) is not Christ;[11] the "Virgin," his mother, is simply a "young woman" according to Jewish phraseology;[12] and the sufferings of the Servant of God (Isaiah lii. 13, liii. 9) are not predictions of the death of Jesus.[13] There is a complete severance between the Law and the Gospel; and the God of the latter is the antithesis of the God of the former.[14] "The one was perfect, pure, beneficent, passionless; the other, though not unjust by nature, infected by matter—subject to all the passions of man—cruel, changeable; the New Testament, especially as remodelled by Marcion,[15] was holy, wise, amiable; the Old Testa-

[1] Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, ii. 5; cf. 9.
[2] *Ib.*, ii. 10.
[3] *Ib.*, ii. 11.
[4] *Ib.*, ii. 18.
[5] *Ib.*, ii. 20. Tertullian introduces this by likening the Marcionites to the cuttle-fish, like which "they vomit the blackness of blasphemy" (*tenebras blasphemiæ intervomunt*), *l.c.*
[6] *Ib.*, ii. 21.
[7] *Ib.*, ii. 22.
[8] *Ib.*, ii. 23.
[9] *Ib.*, ii. 24.
[10] *Ib.*, ii. 25.
[11] *Adv. Marc.*, iii. 12.
[12] *Ib.*, iii. 13.
[13] *Ib.*, iii. 17, 18.
[14] *Ib.*, iv. 1.
[15] We give this quotation as a *résumé* by an English historian and divine, but the idea of the "New Testament remodelled by Marcion" is a mere ecclesiastical imagination.

ment, the Law, barbarous, inhuman, contradictory, and detestable."[1]

Marcion ardently maintained the doctrine of the impurity of matter, and he carried it to its logical conclusion, both in speculation and practice. He, therefore, asserting the incredibility of an incarnate God, denied the corporeal reality of the flesh of Christ. His body was a mere semblance and not of human substance; he was not born of a human mother; and the divine nature was not degraded by contact with the flesh.[2] Marcion finds in Paul the purest promulgator of the truth as he understands it, and, emboldened by the Epistle to the Galatians, in which that Apostle rebukes even Apostles for "not walking uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel," he accuses the other Apostles of having depraved the pure form of the Gospel doctrines delivered to them by Jesus,[3] "mixing up matters of the Law with the words of the Saviour."[4]

Tertullian reproaches Marcion with having written the work in which he details the contrasts between Judaism and Christianity, of which we have given the briefest sketch, as an introduction and encouragement to belief in his Gospel, which he ironically calls "the Gospel according to the *Antitheses*";[5] and the charge which the Fathers bring against Marcion is that he laid violent hands on the canonical Gospel of Luke, and manipulated it to suit his own views. "For certainly the whole object at which he laboured in drawing up the 'Antitheses,'" says Tertullian, "amounts to this: that he may prove a disagreement between the Old and New Testament, so that his own Christ may be separated from the Creator, as of another God, as alien from the Law and the Prophets. For this purpose it is certain that he has erased whatever was contrary to his own opinion and in harmony with the Creator, as if interpolated by his partisans, but has retained everything consistent with his own opinion."[6] The whole hypothesis that Marcion's Gospel is a mutilated version of our third Synoptic, in fact, rests upon this accusation.

The principal interest, in connection with the collection of Marcion, centres in his single Gospel, the nature, origin, and identity of which have long been actively and minutely discussed by learned men of all shades of opinion with very varying results. The work itself is unfortunately no longer extant, and our only knowledge of it is derived from the bitter and very inaccurate opponents of Marcion. It seems to have borne much the same analogy to our third canonical Gospel as existed between the Gospel

[1] Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, 1867, ii., p. 77 f.
[2] Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iii. 8 ff. [3] *Ib.*, iv. 3.
[4] *Apostolos enim admiscuisse ea quæ sunt legalia salvatoris verbis* (Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 2, § 2; cf. iii. 12, § 12).
[5] *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 1. [6] *Ib.*, iv. 6.

according to the Hebrews and our first Synoptic. The Fathers, whose uncritical and, in such matters, prejudiced character led them to denounce every variation from their actual texts as a mere falsification, and without argument to assume the exclusive authenticity and originality of our Gospels, which towards the beginning of the third century had acquired wide circulation in the Church, vehemently stigmatised Marcion as an audacious adulterator of the Gospel, and affirmed his evangelical work to be merely a mutilated and falsified version of the "Gospel according to Luke."[1]

This view continued to prevail, almost without question or examination, till towards the end of the eighteenth century, when Biblical criticism began to exhibit the earnestness and activity which have ever since characterised it. Semler first abandoned the prevalent tradition, and, after analysing the evidence, he concluded that Marcion's Gospel and Luke's were different versions of an earlier work,[2] and that the so-called heretical Gospel was one of the numerous Gospels from amongst which the Canonical had been selected by the Church.[3] Griesbach about the same time also rejected the ruling opinion, and denied the close relationship usually asserted to exist between the two Gospels.[4] Löffler[5] and Carrodi[6] strongly supported Semler's conclusion, that Marcion was no mere falsifier of Luke's Gospel, and J. E. C. Schmidt[7] went still further, and asserted that Marcion's Gospel was the genuine Luke, and our actual Gospel a later version of it with alterations and additions. Eichhorn,[8] after a fuller and more exhaustive examination, adopted similar views; he repudiated the statements of Tertullian regarding Marcion's Gospel as utterly untrustworthy, asserting that he had not that work itself before him at all, and he maintained that Marcion's Gospel was the more original text and one of the sources of Luke.[9] Bolten, Bertholdt,[10]

[1] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 27, § 2; iii. 12, § 12; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 2-6; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xlii. 9, 11; Origen, *Contra Cels.*, ii. 27; Theodoret, *Hær, Fab.*, i. 24.

[2] *Vorrede zu Townson's Abhandl. üb. d. vier Evv.*, 1783.

[3] *Neuer Versuch, die Gemeinnützige Auslegung u. anwend. der N. T. zu befördern*, 1786, p. 162 f.; cf. *Prolegg. in Ep. ad Galatas.*

[4] *Curæ in hist. textus epist. Pauli*, 1799, sect. iii., *Opuscula Academica*, ii., p. 124 ff.

[5] *Marcionem Pauli epist. et Lucæ evang. adulterasse dubitatur*, 1788, *in Velthusen Kuinœl et Ruperti Comment. Theologicæ*, 1794, i., pp. 180–218.

[6] *Versuch einer Beleuchtung d. Gesch. des jüd. u. Christl. Bibelkanons*, 1792, ii., p. 158 ff. 169.

[7] *Ueber das achte Evang. des Lucas, in Henke's Mag. für Religions-philos., u. s. w.*, iii., 1796, p. 468 ff., 482 f., 507 f.

[8] *Einl. N. T.*, 1820, i., pp. 43–84.

[9] *Bericht des Lucas von Jesu dem Messia* (Vorbericht, 1796, p. 29 f.).

[10] *Einl. A. u. N. T.*, 1813, iii., p. 1293 ff.

Schleiermacher,[1] and D. Schulz[2] likewise maintained that Marcion's Gospel was by no means a mutilated version of Luke, but, on the contrary, an independent original Gospel. A similar conclusion was arrived at by Gieseler;[3] but later, after Hahn's criticism, he abandoned it, and adopted the opinion that Marcion's Gospel was constructed out of Luke.[4]

On the other hand, the traditional view was maintained by Storr,[5] Arneth,[6] Hug,[7] Neander,[8] and Gratz,[9] although with little originality of investigation or argument; and Paulus[10] sought to reconcile both views by admitting that Marcion had before him the Gospel of Luke, but denying that he mutilated it, arguing that Tertullian did not base his arguments on the actual Gospel of Marcion, but upon his work, the *Antithesis*. Hahn,[11] however, undertook a more exhaustive examination of the problem, attempting to reconstruct the text of Marcion's Gospel[12] from the statements of Tertullian and Epiphanius, and he came to the conclusion that the work was a mere version, with omissions and alterations made by the Heresiarch in the interest of his system, of the third canonical Gospel. Olshausen[13] arrived at the same result, and, with more or less of modification but no detailed argument, similar opinions were expressed by Credner,[14] De Wette,[15] and others.

Not satisfied, however, with the method and results of Hahn and Olshausen, whose examination, although more minute than any previously undertaken, still left much to be desired, Ritschl[16] made a further thorough investigation of the character of Marcion's Gospel, and decided that it was in no case a mutilated version of Luke, but, on the contrary, an original and independent work, from which the canonical Gospel was produced by the introduction

[1] *Sämmtl. Werke*, viii.; *Einl. N. T.*, 1845, p. 64 f., 197 f., 214 f.
[2] *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1829, 3, pp. 586–595.
[3] *Entst. schr. Evv.*, 1818, p. 24 ff.
[4] *Revens. d. Hahn's Das Ev. Marcion's in Hall. Allg. Litt. Z.*, 1823, p. 225 ff.; *K. G.*, i., § 45.
[5] *Zweck d. Evang. Gesch. u. Br. Johan.*, 1786, pp. 254–265.
[6] *Ueber d. Bekanntsch. Marcion's mit. u. Kanon, u. s. w.*, 1809.
[7] *Einl. N. T.*, 1847, i., p. 64 ff.
[8] *Genet. Entwickl. d. vorn. Gnost. Syst.*, 1818, p. 311 ff.; cf. *Allg. K. G.*, 1843, ii., pp. 792–816.
[9] *Krit. Unters. üb. Marcion's Evang.*, 1818.
[10] *Theol. exeg. Conserv.*, 1822, *Lief.* i., p. 115 ff.
[11] *Das. Evang. Marcion's in seiner urspriingl. Gestalt*, 1823.
[12] The reconstructed text is in *Thilo's Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, 1832, pp. 403–486.
[13] *Die Echtheit der vier kan. Evv.*, 1823, pp. 107–215.
[14] *Beiträge*, i., p. 43.
[15] *Einl. N. T., 6th ausg.*, 1860, p. 119 ff.
[16] *Das Evangelium Marcion's*, 1846.

of anti-Marcionitish passages and readings. Baur[1] strongly enunciated similar views, and maintained that the whole error lay in the mistake of the Fathers, who had, with characteristic assumption, asserted the earlier and shorter Gospel of Marcion to be an abbreviation of the later canonical Gospel, instead of recognising the latter as a mere extension of the former. Schwegler[2] had already, in a remarkable criticism of Marcion's Gospel, declared it to be an independent and original work, and in no sense a mutilated Luke, but, on the contrary, probably the source of that Gospel. Köstlin,[3] while stating that the theory that Marcion's Gospel was an earlier work and the basis of that ascribed to Luke was not very probable, affirmed that much of the Marcionitish text was more original than the canonical, and that both Gospels must be considered versions of the same original, although Luke's was the later and more corrupt.

These results, however, did not satisfy Volkmar,[4] who entered afresh upon a searching examination of the whole subject, and concluded that whilst, on the one hand, the Gospel of Marcion was not a mere falsified and mutilated form of the canonical Gospel, neither was it, on the other, an earlier work, and still less the original Gospel of Luke, but merely a Gnostic compilation from what, so far as we are concerned, may be called the oldest codex of Luke's Gospel, which itself is nothing more than a similar Pauline edition of the original Gospel. Volkmar's analysis, together with the arguments of Hilgenfeld, succeeded in convincing Ritschl,[5] who withdrew from his previous opinions, and, with those critics, merely maintained some of Marcion's readings to be more original than those of Luke,[6] and generally defended Marcion from the aspersions of the Fathers on the ground that his procedure with regard to Luke's Gospel was precisely that of the canonical Evangelists to each other;[7] Luke himself being clearly dependent both on Mark and Matthew.[8] Baur was likewise induced by Volkmar's and Hilgenfeld's arguments to modify his views;[9] but, although for the first time he admitted that Marcion had altered the original of his Gospel frequently for dogmatic reasons, he still maintained that there was an older form of the Gospel without the earlier chapters, from which both Marcion and Luke directly constructed their Gospels—both of them stood in the same line in regard to the original; both

[1] *Krit. Unters. kan. Evv.*, 1847, p. 397 ff.
[2] *Das nachap. Zeit.*, 1846, i., p. 260 ff.
[3] *Der Ursprung d. synopt. Evv.*, 1853, p. 303 ff.
[4] *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, pp. 110–138, pp. 185–235.
[5] *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1851, p. 528 ff.
[6] *Ib.*, p. 530 ff.
[7] *Ib.*, p. 529.
[8] *Ib.*, p. 534 ff.
[9] *Das Markusevang. Anhang üb. das Ev. Marcion's*, 1851, p. 191 ff.

altered it; the one abbreviated, the other extended it.[1] Encouraged by this success, but not yet satisfied, Volkmar immediately undertook a further and more exhaustive examination of the text of Marcion in the hope of finally settling the discussion; and he again, but with greater emphasis, confirmed his previous results.[2] In the meantime, Hilgenfeld[3] had seriously attacked the problem, and, like Hahn and Volkmar, had sought to reconstruct the text of Marcion, and, whilst admitting many more original and genuine readings in the text of Marcion, he had also decided that his Gospel was dependent on Luke, although he further concluded that the text of Luke had subsequently gone through another, though slight, manipulation before it assumed its present form. These conclusions he again fully confirmed after a renewed investigation of the subject.[4]

This brief sketch of the controversy which has so long occupied the attention of critics will, at least, show the uncertainty of the data upon which any decision is to be based. We have not attempted to give more than the barest outlines, but it will appear as we go on that most of those who decide against the general independence of Marcion's Gospel at the same time admit his partial originality and the superiority of some of his readings over those of the third Synoptic, and justify his treatment of Luke as a procedure common to the Evangelists, and warranted not only by their example, but by the fact that no Gospels had in his time emerged from the position of private documents in limited circulation.

Marcion's Gospel not being any longer extant, it is important to establish clearly the nature of our knowledge regarding it and the exact value of the data from which various attempts have been made to reconstruct the text. It is manifest that the evidential force of any deductions from a reconstructed text is almost wholly dependent on the accuracy and sufficiency of the materials from which that text is derived.

The principal sources of our information regarding Marcion's Gospel are the works of his most bitter denouncers, Tertullian and Epiphanius, who, it must be borne in mind, wrote long after his time—the work of Tertullian against Marcion having been composed about A.D. 208,[5] and that of Epiphanius a century later.

[1] *Ib.*, p. 225 f. [2] *Das Evang. Marcion's*, 1852.

[3] *Ueb. die Evv. Justin's der Clem. Hom. und Marcion's*, 1850, p. 389 ff.

[4] *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1853, pp. 192 244. [A remarkably able and interesting work, *The Origin of the Third Gospel*, by P. C. Sense, M.A., 1901, may be advantageously referred to. Mr. Sense maintains that the third Gospel was compiled from the writing used by the Marcionites, known as the Marcionite Gospel, and other apocryphal Gospels.]

[5] Cf. Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, i. 15.

We may likewise merely mention here the "*Dialogus de recta in deum fide*," commonly attributed to Origen, although it cannot have been composed earlier than the middle of the fourth century. The first three sections are directed against the Marcionites, but only deal with the late forms of their doctrines. As Volkmar admits that the author clearly had only a general acquaintance with the *Antitheses* and principal proof passages of the Marcionites, but, although he certainly possessed the Epistles, had not the Gospel of Marcion itself,[1] we need not now more particularly consider it.

We are, therefore, dependent upon the "dogmatic and partly blind and unjust adversaries"[2] of Marcion for our only knowledge of the text they stigmatise; and, when the character of polemical discussion in the early centuries of our era is considered, it is certain that great caution must be exercised, and not too much weight attached to the statement of opponents who regarded a heretic with abhorrence and attacked him with an acrimony which carried them far beyond the limits of fairness and truth. Their religious controversy bristles with misstatements, and is turbid with pious abuse. Tertullian was a master of this style, and the vehement vituperation with which he opens[3] and often interlards his work against "the impious and sacrilegious Marcion" offers anything but a guarantee of fair and legitimate criticism. Epiphanius was, if possible, still more passionate and exaggerated in his representations against him. Undue importance must not, therefore, be attributed to their statements.[4]

Not only should there be caution exercised in receiving the representations of one side in a religious discussion, but more particularly is such caution necessary in the case of Tertullian, whose trustworthiness is very far from being above suspicion, and whose inaccuracy is often apparent. "*Son christianisme*," says Reuss, "*est ardent, sincère, profondément ancré dans son âme. L'on voit qu'il en vit. Mais ce christianisme est âpre, insolent, brutal, ferrailleur. Il est sans onction et sans charité, quelquefois même sans loyauté, dès qu'il se trouve en face d'une opposition quelconque. C'est un soldat qui ne sait que se battre et qui oublie, tout en se battant, qu'il faut aussi respecter son ennemi. Dialecticien subtil et rusé, il excelle à ridiculiser ses adversaires. L'injure, le sarcasme, un langage qui rappelle parfois en vérité le genre de Rabelais, une effronterie d'affirmation dans les moments de faiblesse qui frise et*

[1] *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 53.

[2] Volkmar, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, p. 120.

[3] *Adv. Marc.*, i. 1.

[4] Reuss, *Hist. du Canon*, p. 71 ff.; Gieseler, *Entst. schr. Evv.*, p. 25; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 75; Volkmar, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, p. 120; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 276; De Wette, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 122.

atteint même la mauvaise foi, voilà ses armes. Je sais ce qu'il faut en cela mettre sur le compte de l'époque.....Si, au second siècle, tous les partis, sauf quelques gnostiques, sont intolérants, Tertullian l'est plus que tout le monde."[1]

The charge of mutilating and interpolating the Gospel of Luke is first brought against Marcion by Irenæus,[2] and it is repeated with still greater vehemence and fulness by Tertullian[3] and Epiphanius;[4] but the mere assertion by Fathers at the end of the second and in the third centuries, that a Gospel different from their own was one of the canonical Gospels falsified and mutilated, can have no weight in itself in the inquiry as to the real nature of that work. Their arbitrary assumption of exclusive originality and priority for the four Gospels of the Church led them, without any attempt at argument, to treat every other evangelical work as an offshoot or falsification of these. The arguments by which Tertullian endeavours to establish that the Gospels of Luke and the other canonical Evangelists were more ancient than that of Marcion[5] show that he had no idea of historical or critical evidence. We are, however, driven back upon such actual data regarding the text and contents of Marcion's Gospel as are given by the Fathers, as the only basis, in the absence of the Gospel itself, upon which any hypothesis as to its real character can be built. The question therefore is: Are these data sufficiently ample and trustworthy for a decisive judgment from internal evidence—if, indeed, internal evidence in such a case can be decisive at all.

All that we know, then, of Marcion's Gospel is simply what Tertullian and Epiphanius have stated with regard to it. It is undeniable and, indeed, is universally admitted, that their object in dealing with it at all was entirely dogmatic, and not in the least degree critical. The spirit of that age was so essentially uncritical that not even the canonical text could waken it into activity. Tertullian very clearly states what his object was in attacking Marcion's Gospel. After asserting that the whole aim of the Heresiarch was to prove a disagreement between the Old Testament and the New, and that, for this purpose, he had erased from the Gospel all that was contrary to his opinion, and retained all that he had considered favourable,

[1] Reuss, *Rev. de Théol.*, xv., 1857, p. 67 f. Cf. Mansel, *The Gnostic Heresies*, 1875, p. 250, p. 259 f.

[2] *Et super hæc, id quod est secundum Lucam Evangelium circumcidens.....* (Irenæus, *Adv Hær.*, i. 27, § 2; cf. iii. 11, § 7; 12, § 12; 14, § 4).

[3] *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 1, 2, 4 *et passim.*

[4] *Hær.*, xlii. 9, 10 *et passim.*

[5] *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5.

Tertullian proceeds to examine the passages retained,[1] with the view of proving that the heretic has shown the same "blindness of heresy," both in that which he has erased and in that which he has retained, inasmuch as the passages which Marcion has allowed to remain are as opposed to his system as those which he has omitted. He conducts the controversy in a free and discursive manner, and, whilst he appears to go through Marcion's Gospel with some regularity, it will be apparent, as we proceed, that mere conjecture has to play a large part in any attempt to reconstruct, from his data, the actual text of Marcion. Epiphanius explains his aim with equal clearness. He had made a number of extracts from the so-called Gospel of Marcion, which seemed to him to refute the heretic, and, after giving a detailed and numbered list of these passages, which he calls σχόλια, he takes them consecutively, and to each adds his "Refutation." His intention is to show how wickedly and disgracefully Marcion has mutilated and falsified the Gospel, and how fruitlessly he has done so, inasmuch as he has stupidly, or by oversight, allowed much to remain in his Gospel by which he may be completely refuted.[2]

As it is impossible within our limits fully to illustrate the procedure of the Fathers with regard to Marcion's Gospel, and the nature and value of the materials they supply, we shall, as far as possible, quote the declarations of critics, and more especially of Volkmar and Hilgenfeld, who, in the true and enlightened spirit of criticism, impartially state the character of the data available for the understanding of the text. As these two critics have, by their able and learned investigations, done more than any others to educe and render possible a decision of the problem, their own estimate of the materials upon which a judgment has to be formed is of double value.

With regard to Tertullian, Volkmar explains that his desire is totally to annihilate the most dangerous heretic of his time—first (Books I. to III.), to overthrow Marcion's system in general as expounded in his *Antithesis*, and then (Book IV.) to show that even the Gospel of Marcion only contains Catholic doctrine (he concludes, *Christus Jesus in Evangelio tuo meus est*, c. 43); and therefore he examines the Gospel only so far as may serve to establish his own view and refute that of Marcion. "To show," Volkmar continues, "wherein this Gospel was falsified or mutilated —*i.e.*, varied from his own — on the contrary, is in no way his design,

[1] *Hæc conveniemus, hæc amplectemur, si nobis cum magis fuerint, si Marcionis præsumptionem perausserint. Tunc et illa constabit eodem vitio hæreticæ cæcitatis erasa quo et hæc reservata. Sic habebit intentio et forma opusculi nostri, etc.* (Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 6).

[2] Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xlii. 9 f.

for he perceives that Marcion could retort the reproach of interpolation, and in his time proof from internal grounds was hardly possible, so that only exceptionally, where a variation seems to him remarkable, does he specially mention it."[1] On the other hand, Volkmar remarks that Tertullian's Latin rendering of the text of Marcion which lay before him—which, although certainly free and having chiefly the substance in view, is still in weightier passages verbally accurate—directly indicates important variations in that text. He goes on to argue that the silence of Tertullian may be weighty testimony for the fact that passages which exist in Luke, but which he does not mention, were missing in Marcion's Gospel, though he does so with considerable reservation. "But his silence *alone*," he says, "can only under certain conditions represent with diplomatic certainty an omission in Marcion. It is indeed probable that he would not lightly have passed over a passage in the Gospel of Marcion which might in any way be contradictory to its system, if one altogether similar had not preceded it, all the more as he frequently drags in by force such proof passages from Marcion's text, and often plainly, but with a certain sophistry, tries to refute his adversary out of the words of his own Gospel. But it remains always possible that in his eagerness he has overlooked much; and, besides, he believes that by his replies to particular passages he has already sufficiently dealt with many others of a similar kind; indeed, avowedly, he will not willingly repeat himself. A certain conclusion, therefore, can only be deduced from the silence of Tertullian when special circumstances enter."[2] Volkmar, however, deduces with certainty from the statements of Tertullian that, whilst he wrote, he had not before him the Gospel of Luke, but intentionally laid it aside, and merely referred to the Marcionitish text, and further that, like all the Fathers of the third century, he preferred the Gospel according to Matthew to the other Synoptics, and was well acquainted with it alone, so that in speaking of the Gospel generally he only has in his memory the sense, and the sense alone, of Luke except in so far as it agrees, or seems to agree, with Matthew.[3]

With regard to the manner in which Tertullian performed the work he had undertaken, Hilgenfeld remarks: "As Tertullian, in going through the Marcionitish Gospel, has only the object of refutation in view, he very rarely states explicitly what is missing from it; and as, on the one hand, we can only venture to conclude from the silence of Tertullian that a passage is wanting, when it is altogether inexplicable that he should not have made use of it

[1] Volkmar, *Das Evang. Marcion's*, p. 29.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 29 f.; cf. *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1855, p. 237. [3] *Ib.*, p. 30 f

for the purpose of refutation; so, on the other, we must also know how Marcion used and interpreted the Gospel, and should never lose sight of Tertullian's refutation and defence."[1]

Hahn substantially expresses the same opinions. He says: "Inasmuch as Tertullian goes through the Marcionitish text with the view of refuting the heretic out of that which he accepts, and not of critically pointing out all variations, falsifications, and passages rejected, he frequently quotes the falsified or altered Marcionitish text without expressly mentioning the variations.[2]..... Yet he cannot refrain—although this was not his object—occasionally, from noticing amongst other things any falsifications and omissions which, when he perhaps examined the text of Luke or had a lively recollection of it, struck and too grievously offended him."[3]

Volkmar's opinion of the procedure of Epiphanius is still more unfavourable. Contrasting it with that of Tertullian, he characterises it as "more superficial," and he considers that its only merit is its presenting an independent view of Marcion's Gospel. Further than this, however, he says: "How far we can build upon his statements, whether as regards their completeness or their trustworthiness, is not yet made altogether clear."[4] Volkmar goes on to show how thoroughly Epiphanius intended to do his work, and yet that, although from what he himself leads us to expect, we might hope to find a complete statement of Marcion's sins, the Father himself disappoints such an expectation by his own admission of incompleteness. He complains generally of his free and misleading method of quotation, such, for instance, as his alteration of the text without explanation; alteration of the same passage on different occasions in more than one way; abbreviations, and omissions of parts of quotations; the sudden breaking off of passages just commenced with the indefinite *καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς* or *καὶ τὸ λοιπόν*, without any indication how much this may include.[5]

Volkmar, indeed, explains that Epiphanius is only thoroughly trustworthy where, and *so far as*, he wishes to state in his *Scholia* an omission or variation in Marcion's text from his own canonical Gospel, in which case he minutely registers the smallest point; but this is to be clearly distinguished from any charge of falsification brought against Marcion in his *Refutations*; for only while drawing up his *Scholia* had he the Marcionitish Gospel before him and compared it with Luke; but in the case of the *Refutations*, on the contrary, which he wrote later, he did not

[1] *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 397.
[2] *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 96.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 98.
[4] Volkmar, *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 32, cf. p. 43.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 33 ff.; cf. Hahn, *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 123 ff.

again compare the Gospel of Luke. "It is, however, altogether different," continues Volkmar, "as regards the statements of Epiphanius concerning the part of the Gospel of Luke which is preserved in Marcion. Whilst he desires to be *strictly literal* in the account of the *variations*, and also with two exceptions *is* so, he so generally adheres *only to the purport* of the passages retained by Marcion that altogether literal quotations are quite exceptional; *throughout*, however, where passages of greater extent are referred to, these are not merely abbreviated, but also are quoted *very freely*, and nowhere can we reckon that the passage in Marcion ran verbally as Epiphanius quotes it."[1] And to this we may add a remark made further on: "We cannot in general rely upon the accuracy of his statements in regard to that which Marcion had in common with Luke."[2] On the other hand, Volkmar had previously said: "Absolute completeness in regard to that which Marcion's Gospel did not contain is not to be reckoned upon in his *Scholia*. He has certainly not intended to pass over anything, but in the eagerness which so easily renders men superficial and blind much has escaped him."[3]

Hahn bears similar testimony to the incompleteness of Epiphanius. "It was not his purpose," he says, "fully to notice all falsifications, variations, and omissions, although he does mark most of them, but merely to extract from the Gospel of Marcion, as well as from his collection of Epistles, what seemed to him well suited for refutation."[4] But he immediately adds: "When he quotes the passage from Marcion's text, however, in which such falsifications occur, he generally -but not always—notes them more or less precisely, and he had himself laid it down as a subsidiary object of his work to pay attention to such falsifications."[5] A little further on he says: "In the quotations of the remaining passages which Epiphanius did not find different from the Gospel of Luke, and where he, therefore, says nothing of falsification or omission, he is often very free, neither adhering strictly to the particular words, nor to their arrangement; but his favourite practice is to give their substance and sense for the purpose of refuting his opponent. He presupposes the words as known from the Gospel of Luke."[6]

It must be stated, however, that both Volkmar[7] and Hilgenfeld[8] consider that the representations of Tertullian and Epiphanius supplement each other, and enable the contents of Marcion's Gospel to be ascertained with tolerable certainty. Yet a few pages earlier

[1] Volkmar, *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 43 f.; cf. p. 34.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 45.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 33.
[4] Hahn, *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 121.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 122.
[6] *Ib.*, p. 123 f.
[7] Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 45 ff.
[8] *Die Ev. Justin's*, p. 397 f.

Volkmar had pointed out that "The ground for a certain fixture of the text of the Marcionitish Gospel seems completely taken away by the fact that Tertullian and Epiphanius, in their statements regarding its state, not merely repeatedly seem to, but in part actually do, directly contradict each other."[1] Hahn endeavours to explain some of these contradictions by imagining that later Marcionites had altered the text of their Gospel, and that Epiphanius had the one form and Tertullian another;[2] but such a doubt only renders the whole of the statements regarding the work more uncertain and insecure. That it is not without some reason, however, appears from the charge which Tertullian brings against the disciples of Marcion: "For they daily alter it (their Gospel) as they are daily refuted by us."[3] In fact, we have no assurance whatever that the work upon which Tertullian and Epiphanius base their charge against Marcion of falsification and mutilation of Luke was Marcion's original Gospel, and we certainly have no historical evidence on the point.

The question even arises whether Tertullian and Epiphanius had Marcion's Gospel in any shape before them when they wrote, or merely his work the *Antitheses*. In commencing his onslaught on Marcion's Gospel, Tertullian says: "Marcion seems (*videtur*) to have selected Luke to mutilate it."[4] This is the first serious introduction of his "mutilation hypothesis," which he thenceforward presses with so much assurance; but the expression is very uncertain for so decided a controversialist, if he had been able to speak more positively. We have seen that it is admitted that Epiphanius wrote without again comparing the Gospel of Marcion with Luke, and it is also conceded that Tertullian, at least, had not the canonical Gospel, but in professing to quote Luke evidently does so from memory, and approximates his text to Matthew, with which Gospel, like most of the Fathers, he was better acquainted. This may be illustrated by the fact that both Tertullian and Epiphanius reproach Marcion with erasing passages from the Gospel of Luke which never were in Luke at all. In one place Tertullian says: "Marcion, you must also remove this from the Gospel: 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel,'[5] and 'It is not meet to take the children's bread and give it to dogs,'[6] in order, be it known, that Christ may not

[1] Volkmar, *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 22 f., p. 46 ff.; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1854, p. 106.

[2] Hahn, *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 130 f., p. 169, p. 224 ff.; cf. Neudecker, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 82.

[3] *Nam et quotidie reformant illud, prout a nobis quotidie revincuntur. Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5; cf. *Dial. de recta in deum fide*, § 5; Orig., *Opp.*, i., p. 867.

[4] *Nam ex iis commentatoribus, quos habemus, Lucam videtur Marcion elegisse, quem cæderet* (*Adv. Marc.*, iv. 2).

[5] Matt. xv. 24. [6] *Ib.*, xv. 26.

seem to be an Israelite.[1] The "Great African" thus taunts his opponent, evidently under the impression that the two passages were in Luke, immediately after he had accused Marcion of having actually expunged from that Gospel, "as an interpolation,"[2] the saying that Christ had not come to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them,[3] which likewise never formed part of it. He repeats a similar charge on several other occasions.[4] Epiphanius commits the same mistake of reproaching Marcion with omitting from Luke what is only found in Matthew.[5] We have, in fact, no certain guarantee of the accuracy or trustworthiness of their statements.

We have said enough, we trust, to show that the sources for the reconstruction of a text of Marcion's Gospel are most unsatisfactory, and no one who attentively studies the analysis of Hahn, Ritschl, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, and others, who have examined and systematised the data of the Fathers, can fail to be struck by the uncertainty which prevails throughout, the almost continuous vagueness and consequent opening, nay, necessity, for conjecture, and the absence of really sure indications. The Fathers had no intention of showing what Marcion's text actually was, and, their object being solely dogmatic and not critical, their statements are very insufficient for the purpose. The materials have had to be ingeniously collected and sifted from polemical writings whose authors, so far from professing to furnish them, were only bent upon seeking in Marcion's Gospel such points as could legitimately, or by sophistical skill, be used against him. Passing observations, general remarks, as well as direct statements, have too often been the only indications guiding the patient explorers, and in the absence of certain information the silence of the angry Fathers has been made the basis for important conclusions. It is evident that not only is such a procedure necessarily uncertain and insecure, but that it rests upon assumptions with regard to the intelligence, care, and accuracy of Tertullian and Epiphanius, which are not sufficiently justified by that part of their treatment of Marcion's text which we can examine and appreciate. And when all these doubtful landmarks have failed, too many passages have been left to the mere judgment of critics, as to whether they were too opposed to Marcion's system to have been retained by him, or too favourable to have been omitted. The reconstructed texts, as might be expected, differ from each other, and one Editor finds

[1] *Marcion, aufer etiam illud de evangelio: non sum missus, nisi ad oves perditas domus Israel; et: non est auferre panem filiis et dare eum canibus, ne scilicet Christus Israelis videretur* (*Adv. Marc.*, iv. 7).

[2] *Hoc enim Marcion ut additum erasit* (*Adv. Marc.*, iv. 7).

[3] Matt. v. 17.

[4] *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 9, 12; ii. 17, iv. 17, 36.

[5] *Hær.*, xlii., p. 322 f., Ref. 1; cf. Luke v. 14; Matt. viii. 4.

the results of his predecessors incomplete or unsatisfactory, although naturally, at each successive attempt, the materials previously collected and adopted have contributed to an apparently more complete result. After complaining of the incompleteness and uncertainty of the statements of Tertullian and Epiphanius, Ritschl affirms that they furnish so little solid material on which to base a hypothesis that rather by means of a hypothesis must we determine the remains of the Gospel from Tertullian.[1] Hilgenfeld quotes this with approval, and adds that at least Ritschl's opinion is so far right that all the facts of the case can no longer be settled from external data, and that the general view regarding the Gospel only can decide many points.[2] This means, of course, that hypothesis is to supply that which is wanting in the Fathers. Volkmar, in the introduction to his last comprehensive work on Marcion's Gospel, says: "And, in fact, it is no wonder that critics have for so long, and substantially to so little effect, fought over the protean question, for there has been so much uncertainty as to the very basis (Fundament) itself—the precise text of the remarkable document—that Baur has found full ground for rejecting, as unfounded, the supposition on which that finally-attained decision (his previous one) rested."[3] Critics of all shades of opinion are forced to admit the incompleteness of the materials for any certain reconstruction of Marcion's text, and consequently for an absolute settlement of the question from internal evidence, although the labours of Volkmar and Hilgenfeld have materially increased our knowledge of the contents of his Gospel.

In the earlier editions of this work,[4] we contended that the theory that Marcion's Gospel was a mutilated form of our third Synoptic had not been established, and that more probably it was an earlier work, from which our Gospel might have been elaborated. Since the sixth edition of this work was completed, however, a very able examination of Marcion's Gospel has been made by Dr. Sanday,[5] which has convinced us that our earlier hypothesis is untenable; that the portions of our third Synoptic excluded from Marcion's Gospel were really written by the same pen which composed the mass of the work, and, consequently, that our third Synoptic existed in his time, and was substantially in the hands of Marcion. This conviction is mainly the result of the linguistic analysis,

[1] Ritschl, *Das Evv. Marcion's*, p. 55.
[2] Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 445.
[3] Volkmar, *Das Ev. Marcion's*, 1852, p. 19 f.
[4] For the arguments, omitted here, see the complete edition, 1879, vol. ii., pp. 108–138.
[5] *Fortnightly Review*, 1875, p. 855 ff.; *The Gospels in Second Century*, 1876, p. 204 ff.

sufficiently indicated by Dr. Sanday and, since, exhaustively carried out for ourselves. We still consider the argument based upon the dogmatic views of Marcion, which has hitherto been almost exclusively relied on, quite inconclusive by itself; but the linguistic test, applied practically for the first time in this controversy by Dr. Sanday, must, we think, prove irresistible to all who are familiar with the comparatively limited vocabulary of New Testament writers. Throughout the omitted sections peculiarities of language and expression abound which clearly distinguish the general composer of the third Gospel, and it is, consequently, not possible reasonably to maintain that these sections are additions subsequently made by a different hand, which seems to be the only legitimate course open to those who would deny that Marcion's Gospel originally contained them.

Here, then, we find evidence of the existence of our third Synoptic about the year 140, and it may of course be inferred that it must have been composed at least some time before that date.[1] It is important, however, to estimate aright the facts actually before us and the deductions which may be drawn from them. The testimony of Marcion does not throw any light upon the authorship or origin of the Gospel of which he made use. Its superscription was simply "The Gospel," or "The Gospel of the Lord" (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, or εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Κυρίου),[2] and no author's name was attached to it. The Heresiarch did not pretend to have written it himself, nor did he ascribe it to any other person. Tertullian, in fact, reproaches him with its anonymity. "And here already I might make a stand," he says at the very opening of his attack on Marcion's Gospel, "contending that a work should not be recognised which does not hold its front erect.....which does not give a pledge of its trustworthiness by the fulness of its title, and the due declaration of its author."[3] Not only did Marcion himself not in any way connect the name of Luke with his Gospel, but his followers repudiated the idea that Luke was its author.[4]

[1] With regard to this, the considerations, advanced in connection with the Acts of the Apostles, as to the author's use of the works of Josephus should be referred to.

[2] *Marcion Evangelio suo nullum adscribit auctorem* (Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 2; *Dial. de recta fide*, § 1).

[3] *Et possem hic jam gradum figere, non agnoscendum contendens opus, quod non erigat frontem, quod nullam constantiam præferat, nullam fidem repromittat de plenitudine tituli et professione debita auctoris* (Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 2).

[4] *Dial. de recta fide*, § 1. Cf. Bertholdt, *Einl.*, iii., p. 1295, 1218 ff.; Eichhorn, *Einl. N. T.*, i., p. 79 f.; Gieseler, *Entst. schr. Evv.*, p. 25; Holtzmann, in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, viii., p. 563. The later Marcionites affirmed their Gospel to have been written by Christ himself, and the particulars of the Crucifixion, etc., to have been added by Paul.

In admitting the substantial identity of Marcion's Gospel and our third Synoptic, therefore, no advance is made towards establishing the authorship of Luke. The Gospel remains anonymous still. On the other hand, we ascertain the important fact that, so far from its having any authoritative or infallible character at that time, Marcion regarded our Synoptic as a work perverted by Jewish influences, and requiring to be freely expurgated in the interests of truth. Amended by very considerable omissions and alterations, Marcion certainly held it in high respect as a record of the teaching of Jesus, but beyond this circumstance, and the mere fact of its existence in his day, we learn nothing from the evidence of Marcion. It can scarcely be maintained that this does much to authenticate the third Synoptic as a record of miracles and a witness for the reality of Divine Revelation.

There is no evidence whatever that Marcion had any knowledge of the other canonical Gospels in any form. None of his writings are extant, and no direct assertion is made even by the Fathers that he knew them, although from their dogmatic point of view they assume that these Gospels existed from the very first, and therefore insinuate that, as he only recognised one Gospel, he rejected the rest.[1] When Irenæus says: "He persuaded his disciples that he himself was more veracious than were the Apostles who handed down the Gospel, though he delivered to them not the Gospel, but part of the Gospel,"[2] it is quite clear that he speaks of the Gospel –the good tidings, Christianity—and not of specific written Gospels. In another passage which is referred to by Apologists, Irenæus says of the Marcionites that they have asserted "That even the Apostles proclaimed the Gospel still under the influence of Jewish sentiments; but that they themselves are more sound and more judicious than the Apostles. Wherefore also Marcion and his followers have had recourse to mutilating the Scriptures, not recognising some books at all, but curtailing the Gospel according to Luke and the Epistles of Paul; these, they say, are alone authentic which they themselves have abbreviated."[3] These remarks chiefly refer to the followers of Marcion, and as we have shown, when treating of

[1] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 27, § 2; cf. iii. 2; 12, § 12; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 3; cf. *De Carne Christi*, 2, 3.

[2] *Semetipsum esse veraciorem, quam sunt hi, qui Evangelium tradiderunt, apostoli, suasit discipulis suis: non Evangelium, sed particulam Evangelii tradens eis* (*Adv. Hær.*, i. 27, § 2).

[3] *Et apostolos quidem adhuc quæ sunt Judæorum sentientes, annuntiasse Evangelium: se autem sinceriores, et prudentiores apostolis esse. Unde et Marcion, et qui ab eo sunt, ad intercidendas conversi sunt Scripturas, quasdam quidem in totum non cognoscentes, secundum Lucam autem Evangelium, et Epistolas Pauli decurtantes, hæc sola legitima esse dicunt, quæ ipsi minoraverunt* (*Adv. Hær.*, iii. 12, § 12).

Valentinus, Irenæus is expressly writing against members of heretical sects living in his own day, and not of the founders of those sects.[1] The Marcionites of the time of Irenæus no doubt deliberately rejected the Gospels, but it does not by any means follow that Marcion himself knew anything of them. As yet we have not met with any evidence even of their existence.

The evidence of Tertullian is not a whit more valuable. In the passage usually cited he says: "But Marcion, lighting upon the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, in which he reproaches even Apostles for not walking uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, as well as accuses certain false Apostles of perverting the Gospel of Christ, tries with all his might to destroy the status of those Gospels which are put forth as genuine and under the name of Apostles, or at least of contemporaries of the Apostles, in order, be it known, to confer upon his own the credit which he takes from them."[2] Now here again it is clear that Tertullian is simply applying, by inference, Marcion's views with regard to the preaching of the Gospel by the two parties in the Church, represented by the Apostle Paul and the "pillar" Apostles whose leaning to Jewish doctrines he condemned, to the written Gospels recognised in his day, though not in Marcion's. "It is uncertain," says even Dr. Westcott, "whether Tertullian in the passage quoted speaks from a knowledge of what Marcion may have written on the subject, or simply from his own point of sight."[3] Any doubt is, however, removed on examining the context, for Tertullian proceeds to argue that if Paul censured Peter, John, and James, it was for changing their company from respect of persons; and similarly, "if false apostles crept in," they betrayed their character by insisting on Jewish observances. "So that it was *not on account of their preaching*, but of their conversation, that they were pointed out by Paul";[4] and he goes on to argue that if Marcion thus accuses Apostles of having depraved the Gospel by their dissimulation, he accuses Christ in accusing those whom Christ selected.[5] It is palpable, therefore, that Marcion, in whatever he may have written, referred to the preaching of the Gospel, or Christianity, by Apostles who retained their Jewish prejudices in favour of

[1] Cf. *Adv. Hær.*, i., *Præf.*, § 2; iii. *Præf.*, *etc.*

[2] *Sed enim Marcion nactus epistolam Pauli ad Galatas, etiam ipsos apostolos suggillantis ut non recto pede incedentes ad veritatem evangelii, simul et accusantis pseudapostolos quosdam pervertentes evangelium Christi, connititur ad destruendum statum eorum evangeliorum, quæ propria et sub apostolorum nomine eduntur, vel etiam apostolicorum, ut scilicet fidem, quam illis adimit, suo conferat* (*Adv. Marc.*, iv. 3; cf. *de Carne Christi*, 2, 3).

[3] *On the Canon*, p. 276, note 1.

[4] *Adeo non de prædicatione, sed de conversatione a Paulo denotabantur* (*Adv. Marc.*, iv. 3).

[5] *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 3.

circumcision and legal observances, and not to written Gospels. Tertullian merely assumes, with his usual audacity, that the Church had the four Gospels from the very first, and therefore that Marcion, who had only one Gospel, knew the others and deliberately rejected them.

CHAPTER VIII.

TATIAN—DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH

From Marcion we now turn to Tatian, another so-called heretic leader. Tatian, an Assyrian by birth,[1] embraced Christianity and became a disciple of Justin Martyr[2] in Rome, sharing with him, as it seems, the persecution excited by Crescens the Cynic[3] to which Justin fell a victim. After the death of Justin, Tatian, who till then had continued thoroughly orthodox, left Rome and joined the sect of the Encratites, of which, however, he was not the founder, and became the leading exponent of their austere and ascetic doctrines.[4]

The only one of his writings which is still extant is his *Oration to the Greeks* (λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας). This work was written after the death of Justin, for in it he refers to that event,[5] and it is generally dated between A.D. 170–175. Tischendorf does not assert that there is any quotation in this address taken from the synoptic Gospels;[6] and Dr. Westcott only affirms that it contains a "clear reference" to "a parable recorded by St. Matthew," and he excuses the slightness of this evidence by adding: "The absence of more explicit testimony to the books of the New Testament is to be accounted for by the style of his writing, and not by his unworthy estimate of their importance,"[7] a remark which is not very pertinent, as we know nothing whatever with regard to Tatian's estimate of any such books.

The supposed "clear reference" is as follows: "For by means of a certain hidden treasure (ἀποκρύφου θησαυροῦ) he made himself lord of all that we possess, in digging for which though we were covered with dust, yet we give it the occasion of falling into our hands and abiding with us."[8] This is claimed as a reference to Matt. xiii. 44: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hidden (θησαυρῷ κεκρυμμένῳ) in the field, which a man found and hid, and for his joy he goeth and selleth all that he hath and buyeth that field." So faint a similarity could not prove anything, but it is evident that there are decided differences here, and the passage does not warrant the deduction that he

[1] *Oratio ad Græcos, ed Otto*, § 42. [2] *Ib.*, § 18. [3] *Ib.*, § 19.
[4] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 29; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 28; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xlvi. 1; Hieron., *De Vir. Illustr.*, 29; Theodoret, *Hær. Fab.*, i. 20.
[5] *Orat. ad Gr.*, § 19. [6] Cf. *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 16 f.
[7] *On the Canon*, p. 278. [8] *Orat. ad Gr.*, § 30.

must have derived it from our Matthew, and not from any other of the numerous Gospels which we know to have early been in circulation. Ewald ascribes the parable in Matthew originally to the *Spruchsammlung* or collection of Discourses, the second of the four works out of which he considers our first Synoptic to have been compiled.[1]

Although neither Tischendorf nor Dr. Westcott thinks it worth while to refer to it, some writers claim another passage in the Oration as a reference to our third Synoptic. "Laugh ye: nevertheless you shall weep."[2] This is compared with Luke vi. 25: "Woe unto you that laugh now: for ye shall mourn and weep."[3] Here, again, it is not possible to trace a reference in the words of Tatian specially to our third Gospel. If there be one part of the Gospel which was more known than another in the first ages of Christianity, it was the Sermon on the Mount, and there can be no doubt that many evangelical works now lost contained versions of it. Ewald likewise assigns this passage of Luke originally to the *Spruchsammlung*,[4] and no one can doubt that the saying was recorded long before the writer of the third Gospel undertook to compile evangelical history as so many had done before him.

Further on, however, Dr. Westcott says: "It can be gathered from Clement of Alexandria.....that he (Tatian) endeavoured to derive authority for his peculiar opinions from the Epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians, and probably from the Epistle to the Ephesians, and the Gospel of St. Matthew."[5] The allusion here is to a passage in the *Stromata* of Clement, in which reference is supposed by Dr. Westcott to be made to Tatian. No writer, however, is named, and Clement merely introduces his remark by the words, "a certain person" (τις), and then proceeds to give his application of the injunction, "not to treasure upon earth where moth and rust corrupt" (ἐπὶ γῆς μὴ θησαυρίζειν ὅπου σὴς καὶ βρῶσις ἀφανίζει).[6] The parallel passage in Matthew vi. 19 reads: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt," etc. (μὴ θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, κ.τ.λ.). Dr. Westcott, it is true, merely suggests that "probably" or "perhaps" this may be ascribed to Tatian, but it is almost certain that it was not attributed to him by Clement. Tatian is several times referred to in the course of the same

[1] *Die drei ersten Evv.*, l. c.

[2] Γελᾶτε δὲ ὑμεῖς, ὡς καὶ κλαύσοντες. *Orat. ad. Gr.*, § 32.

[3] οὐαὶ ὑμῖν οἱ γελῶντες νῦν· ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε. Luke vi. 25.

[4] *Die drei ersten Evv.*, l. c.

[5] *On the Canon*, p. 279. [In the 4th edition Dr. Westcott has altered the "probably" of the above sentence to "perhaps," and in a note has addded: "These two last references are from an anonymous citation (τις) which has been commonly assigned to Tatian." Page 318, n. 1.]

[6] *Strom.*, iii. 12, § 86.

chapter, and his words are continued by the use of φησί or γράφει, and it is in the highest degree improbable that Clement should introduce another quotation from him in such immediate context by the vague and distant reference, "a certain person" (τις). On the other hand, reference is made in the chapter to other writers and sects, to one of whom with much greater propriety this expression applies. No weight, therefore, could be attached to any such passage in connection with Tatian. Moreover, the quotation not only does not agree with our Synoptic, but may more probably have been derived from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. It will be remembered that Justin Martyr quotes the same passage, with the same omission of "θησαυρούς," from a Gospel different from our Synoptics.[1]

Tatian, however, is claimed as a witness for the existence of our Gospels, principally on the ground that he is said to have compiled a Gospel which was generally called *Diatessaron* (διὰ τεσσάρων) or "by four," and it is assumed that this was a harmony of our four Gospels.

Our information regarding this Gospel in the writings of the Fathers is, as we shall see, of the scantiest and most unsatisfactory description, and critics have arrived at very various conclusions with regard to its composition. Some of course affirm, with more or less of hesitation, that it was nothing else than a harmony of our four canonical Gospels: many of these, however, are constrained to admit that it was also partly based upon the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Others maintain that it was a harmony of our three Synoptics together with the Gospel according to the Hebrews; whilst many deny that it was composed of our Gospels at all, and either declare it to have been a harmony of the Gospel according to the Hebrews with three other Gospels whose identity cannot be determined, or that it was simply the Gospel according to the Hebrews itself, by which name, as Epiphanius states, it was called by some in his day.[2]

Before proceeding to discuss this work we must consider the date which must be assigned to Tatian's literary career. According to Eusebius, Justin suffered martyrdom A.D. 165,[3] and the generally-received theory is that his death may be set about A.D. 163–165. Tatian's literary activity seems to have begun after his master's death, "and after this we have to allow for his own career, first as an orthodox Christian and then as a heretic."[4] It is argued by some that Tatian was no longer living

[1] Justin, *Apol.*, i. 15; see p. 222 f., p. 232 f.
[2] Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xlvi. 1.
[3] *H. E.*, iv. 16; *Chron. Pasch.*
[4] Lightfoot, Essays on *Supernatural Religion*, p. 274.

when Irenæus wrote of him in the first book of his great work, which, it is said, must be dated between A.D. 178–190; but this is far from certain, and the expressions used by no means necessarily convey such an inference. Nor does the mention of the "Assyrian" by the Alexandrian Clement as one of his teachers,[1] in the first book of the *Stromata*, written not earlier than A.D. 195, throw much light upon the date, nor, indeed, the fact of Rhodon having been one of his disciples. The *Address to the Greeks*, the only one of Tatian's works which has been preserved, was written, as has already been said, after the death of Justin, and is generally dated about A.D. 170–175. This work was certainly written before he had adopted the heretical views which led to his separation from the Church, so that, at least, the date assigned to this composition is some slight indication of the phases of his career. If, therefore, we assume even A.D. 170 as the date of the *Address*, the *Diatessaron*, which was condemned and destroyed as heretical, must, at least, be assigned to a still later period. Dr. Lightfoot, who, without arguing the point, thought the date A.D. 170–175 "probably some years too late" for the *Address*,[2] assigns the *Diatessaron* to A.D. 170;[3] but, unless good reasons can be given for dating the *Address* earlier than A.D. 170–175 and these have not been forthcoming—it is probable that the *Diatessaron* must have been compiled at a later date. The *Address* is completely orthodox, and no one who has attacked Tatian's later views has, apparently, been able to discover even a heretical tendency in its vigorous arguments. Some years must, therefore, reasonably be allowed to elapse before Tatian's opinions changed and led him to arrange a Harmony of Gospels in accordance with them. Probably the date assigned to it should not be earlier than A.D. 175–180,[4] and the later part of this term may be considered the more reasonable. We have no information whatever as to the date of Tatian's death.

If we examine contemporary writings, or such extracts as have come down to us, for information regarding the works of Tatian, we meet with references to several of his compositions. His pupil Rhodon—as quoted by Eusebius, promises to write a work in answer to one by Tatian, in which he professes to explain certain obscurities in the sacred writings.[5] Irenæus denounces some of his heretical views in no measured terms.[6] His disciple —Clement of Alexandria —refers to his treatise *On Perfection according to the Saviour*,[7] and likewise attacks his peculiar

[1] *Strom.*, i. 1, 11. [2] *Essays*, 275. [3] *The Fourth Gospel*, 1892, p. 132.
[4] Zahn dates it soon after A.D. 172 (*Forschungen*, p. 290 f.).
[5] *H. E.*, v. 13. [6] *Adv. Hær.*, i. 28, 1; iii. 23, 8. [7] *Strom.*, iii. 12, 80 f.

opinions, but makes at the same time copious use of his *Address to the Greeks*. The author of the work against the heresy of Artemon, quoted by Eusebius, cites Tatian as an apologist along with men like Justin and Clement, and as maintaining the divinity of Christ.[1] Tertullian,[2] Hippolytus,[3] and Origen[4] refer to him, and combat his opinions. None of these writers, however, make any mention of a Harmony of Gospels in connection with Tatian, nor does any writer prior to Eusebius.

The first time, then, that we hear anything of a Harmony of Gospels ascribed to Tatian, or meet with any trace of such a work, is in the mention of it by Eusebius, writing some century and a half after the Harmony is supposed to have been composed. Eusebius says in the well-known passage: "Tatian, however, their former chief, having put together a certain amalgamation and collection, I know not how, of the Gospels, named this the *Diatessaron*, which even now is current with some."[5] Beyond the mere statement that Tatian made some kind of Harmony of Gospels, which was called *Diatessaron*, nothing could be less explicit than this passage. It seems to be based upon mere hearsay, and the expression "I know not how" (οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως) does not indicate any personal acquaintance with the composition to which Eusebius refers. Dr. Lightfoot argues, on the contrary, that, "so far from implying that Eusebius had no personal knowledge of the work, it" (the expression) "is constantly used by writers in speaking of books where they are perfectly acquainted with the contents, but do not understand the principles or do not approve the method. In idiomatic English it signifies 'I cannot think what he was about,' and is equivalent to 'unaccountably,' 'absurdly,' so that, if anything, it implies knowledge rather than ignorance of the contents."[6] Dr. Lightfoot gives references to a number of examples of its use in the treatise of Origen against Celsus, but when examined they do not in the least prove his point. It is certain that οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως is frequently used to express partial, as well as complete, ignorance—ignorance of something in a book, as well as absence of acquaintance with a book itself; but it always indicates ignorance, real or assumed. If we look at the passage in Eusebius itself, there is nothing to indicate that the words are intended to express anything but imperfect knowledge, or that Eusebius wished to indicate disapproval of such a work. In his *Epistle to*

[1] *H. E.*, v. 28.
[2] *De Jejun.*, 15.
[3] *Philosoph.* viii. 4, 16; x. 18.
[4] *C. Cels.*, i. 16, etc.
[5] Ὁ μέντοι γε πρότερος αὐτῶν ἀρχηγὸς ὁ Ταταιανὸς συνάφειάν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως, τῶν εὐαγγελίων συνθεὶς, τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων τοῦτο προσωνόμασεν, ὃ καὶ παρά τισιν εἰσέτι νῦν φέρεται. *H. E.*, iv. 29.
[6] *Essays*, p. 278.

Carpianus, Eusebius writes of a similar Harmony of Gospels by Ammonius not only without censure, but with approval. If his purpose had been to condemn the *Diatessaron*, he would have said more than this. As it is, he has chronicled the existence of the work without a detail evincing acquaintance with it; but, on the contrary, with a distinct expression of ignorance. The best critics on both sides, amongst whom may be mentioned Credner, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Reuss, Scholten, Zahn, and others, are agreed in inferring that Eusebius had no personal acquaintance with the *Diatessaron*.

It must be admitted that the words of Eusebius give a very scant account of a work of which not a trace has been found in the extant literature of a hundred and fifty years after its supposed composition. Not only are we not told anything of the peculiarities or arrangement of its contents, but we are left in total ignorance even of the language in which it was written. This absence of information is particularly to be regretted in the case of such a work as a Harmony of the Gospels, which, from its very nature, cannot have borne an author's name, and the identification of which inevitably became more difficult as time went on. Continuing our search for information regarding it, we find the rapidly increasing Christian literature a complete blank so far as any Harmony of Gospels by Tatian is concerned. Neither Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, nor Jerome, who refer to other works of Tatian, make any reference to it. We have mentioned incidentally that, in his *Epistle to Carpianus*, Eusebius refers to a similar Harmony of Gospels by Ammonius. No writer mentions the *Diatessaron* again until we come to Epiphanius, writing about the end of the fourth century, or some two hundred years after its compilation. He makes the following remarkable statement: "It is said that the *Diatessaron* Gospel owes its origin to him (Tatian), which some call the Gospel according to the Hebrews."[1]

It is almost universally agreed that Epiphanius, the second writer who refers to the *Diatessaron*, had as little personal knowledge of the work as the first (Eusebius); but several important points are to be deduced from the report which he chronicles. In the first place, it is quite clear that, as has been suggested above, the name of Tatian was not attached to the *Diatessaron*. Had it been so, the expression, "it is said," could not have been used. By the time of Epiphanius the connection of Tatian with his Harmony had already become merely conjectural. How is the fact that some called it the Gospel according to the Hebrews to be explained? It is unnecessary to press the possibility that what

[1] Λέγεται δὲ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγενῆσθαι, ὅπερ κατὰ Ἑβραίους τινὲς καλοῦσι. *Hær.*, 46, 1.

had been understood to be Tatian's *Diatessaron* was nothing but the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which, from having matter common to our Gospels, was mistaken for a Harmony. The Gospel according to the Hebrews was, we know, used by the Encratites, the sect to which Tatian belonged, and at least nothing can be more probable than the hypothesis that, in a Harmony compiled after he had separated himself from the Church, he must have made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, to which his followers were attached. Two facts which we know should be borne in mind in connection with this confusion, if confusion it be, of the *Diatessaron* with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, that this Gospel was constructed on the lines of our first Synoptic, and that it omitted the genealogies, both of which peculiarities are said to be characteristic of the *Diatessaron*.

More than half a century passes before we meet with any fresh mention of Tatian's work, and then we come to a more detailed statement regarding it than we have yet discovered. Writing about A.D. 453, Theodoret gives the following account of what took place in his diocese :—

"He [Tatian] composed the Gospel which is called *Diatessaron*, cutting out the genealogies and such other passages as show the Lord to have been born of the seed of David after the flesh. This work was in use not only among persons belonging to his sect, but also among those who follow the apostolic doctrine, as they did not perceive the mischief of the composition, but used the book in all simplicity on account of its brevity. And I myself found more than two hundred such copies held in respect in the churches in our parts. All these I collected and put away, and I replaced them by the Gospels of the Four Evangelists."[1]

It will be observed that Theodoret does not say that the Gospel of Tatian was a Harmony of four Gospels, but merely that it was "called *Diatessaron*," and it is difficult to suppose that, if it merely omitted "the genealogies and such other passages as show the Lord to have been born of the seed of David after the flesh," a bishop, even in the fifth century, could confiscate two hundred copies of a book when books were so scarce and precious. What could be expected from a Harmony of Gospels but omission of some matter contained in them? One is tempted to think that when Theodoret speaks of "the mischief of the composition," he had in his mind more than these omissions, though he does not enter into full detail. In any case, the omissions specified are all that is added to our knowledge of the *Diatessaron* by the statement of Theodoret.

It may be well to refer here to an apocryphal Syriac work, called the *Doctrine of Addai*, giving a copy of correspondence alleged to

[1] Theodoret, *De Fab. Hær.*

have taken place between "the Lord Jesus Christ and Abgar, King of Edessa." A very early date is assigned to it by many, but Dr. Lightfoot "cannot place it much earlier than the middle of the third century,"[1] and it might safely be set much later. In this little work an account is given of the Church at Edessa, and it is said that the people assembled for prayer and to hear read, along with the Old Testament, the "New of the *Diatessaron*."[2] This might well be explained as a mere reading of four Gospels, but there are certain reasons for believing that it really means a Harmony. Zahn has quoted the following rule from the Canons of Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa (A.D. 412 435): "Let the presbyters and deacons have a care that in all the churches there be provided and read a copy of the distinct Gospel." This "distinct" Gospel is understood to be opposed to the Harmony of four Gospels, and light is thrown upon the point by the fact that, in the Syriac Gospels of Cureton, the first Gospel is described as the "Distinct Gospel of Matthew," meaning, probably, the Gospel in a separate form. Taking this with the statement of Theodoret, it is probable that the *Diatessaron* referred to was that which he confiscated in his diocese. Be this as it may, however, it is clear that, beyond the fact that the *Diatessaron* was read, we have no further information from the *Doctrine of Addai* as to the contents of the *Diatessaron*, the particular Gospels from which it was compiled, their reputed authors, or even the name of the person who prepared the Harmony.

The next reference to the *Diatessaron* which has to be considered comes from Victor of Capua, about the middle of the sixth century. Victor met with a harmony entitled *Diatessaron*, which, as we have already shown to be naturally the case with all such compilations, was anonymous, and he consequently endeavoured to discover a probable author for it. He went to Eusebius for information, and in his *Ecclesiastical History* he found the mention of a *Diatessaron* attributed to Tatian, which has been quoted above; and in his *Epistle to Carpianus*, prefixed to the Canons, he met with the account of another ascribed to Ammonius. The description of the *Diatessaron* of Ammonius of Alexandria given by Eusebius may now be quoted: "He placed by the side of the Gospel according to Matthew the corresponding passages of the other Evangelists, so that, as a necessary result, the sequence in the three was destroyed so far as regards the order of reading."[3] Victor, however, read the passage of Eusebius with a singular variation from that which we have, and cites him as saying that the Gospel which Tatian composed out of four was entitled

[1] *Essays*, p. 279. [2] Phillips, *Doctr. Add*, c. 35.
[3] Eusebius, *Op.* (ed. Migne), iv., p. 1276.

Diapente, or "by five."[1] Whether the copy of Eusebius before him had this reading, or whether he corrected Eusebius from the contents or from the title of his Harmony, cannot now be definitely settled; but there is the distinct statement, and it is all the more curious since he has just said "*unum ex quatuor*," and it is, therefore, difficult to explain the immediate statement of *Diapente* as the title, which contradicts the description, except as a copy of something before him which he records. Dr. Lightfoot argues that Victor, who knew Greek, can hardly have written *Diapente* himself, and attributes the curious reading to the blundering or officiousness of some later scribe.[2] But to write *Diapente* for *Diatessaron* is scarcely like a slip of the pen, and the discrepancy between the Harmony and the name must have been very striking to render probable the theory of officiousness. I will let Dr. Lightfoot's own words state the result of Victor's investigation: "Assuming that the work which he had discovered must be one or other, he decides in favour of the latter (Tatian), because it does not give St. Matthew continuously and append the passages of the other Evangelists, as Eusebius states Ammonius to have done."[3] A little later, Dr. Lightfoot adds: "Thus, Victor gets his information directly from Eusebius, whom he repeats. He knows nothing about Tatian's *Diatessaron* except what Eusebius tells him." We have seen that this was little enough. Dr. Lightfoot expresses a very decided opinion (which he afterwards modifies) that Victor was mistaken in ascribing the authorship to Tatian, but the discussion of this point must be reserved for a more appropriate place further on.

In seeking for mention of the *Diatessaron* of Tatian in extant literature, we have already had to make wide strides through time, but these must now be increased. In a Glossary of Bar-ali, written about the end of the ninth century, we have the next reference to the work: "*Diastarsun* (otherwise *Diakutrum*); the Gospel which is the *Diatessaron*, made by Tatian, the compiled Gospel. A gospel made sense for sense on the sense of the combined four apostolic Gospels. It contains neither the natural nor the traditional genealogy of our Lord Christ; and he who made it—namely, Tatian—has on this account been anathematised."[4] There can be little doubt that Bar-ali derives his information from Theodoret, and does not know the work himself.

[1] "*Ex historia quoque ejus* [*i.e. Eusebii*] *comperi quod Tatianus vir eruditissimus et orator illius temporis clarus unum ex quatuor compaginaverit Evangelium cui titulum Diapente imposuit.*"

[2] *Essays*, p. 286 f. [3] *Ibid*, p. 286.

[4] Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syr.*, i. 869; Zahn, *Forsch.*, i. 98; Harnack, *Gesch. altchristl. Lit.*, i. 2 Hälfte, 1893, p. 494.

We have to pass over a long period before we again hear anything of the *Diatessaron*. We receive some important information regarding it from Dionysius Bar-Salibi, who died A.D. 1207. He wrote a Commentary on the Gospels, in which there is the following statement:—

"Tatian, the disciple of Justin, the philosopher and martyr, selected and patched together from the four Gospels and constructed a Gospel, which he called *Diatessaron*—that is, Miscellanies. On this work Mar Ephrem wrote an exposition; and its commencement was: 'In the beginning was the Word.' Elias of Salamia, who is also called Aphthonius, constructed a Gospel after the likeness of the *Diatessaron* of Ammonius, mentioned by Eusebius in his prologue to the Canons which he made for the Gospel. Elias sought for that *Diatessaron*, and could not find it, and, in consequence, constructed this after its likeness. And the said Elias finds fault with several things in the Canons of Eusebius, and points out errors in them, and rightly. But this copy [work] which Elias composed is not often met with."[1]

Mar Ephrem of Edessa, who is here referred to, is said to have died about A.D. 373, and it is a very curious fact that we hear of such a commentary, upon which the whole argument regarding the *Diatessaron* of Tatian has recently turned, a thousand years after the composition of the Harmony, and some eight centuries from the date of the alleged commentary. About eighty years later than Bar-Salibi, another Syrian father, Gregory Bar-Hebraeus, tells us: "Eusebius of Cæsarea, seeing the corruptions which Ammonius of Alexandria introduced into the Gospel of the *Diatessaron*, that is Miscellanies, which commenced, 'In the beginning was the Word,' and which Mar Ephrem expounded, kept the four Gospels in their integrity, but pointed out the agreement of the words by Canons written in red."[2]

Mr. J. Rendel Harris has recently pointed out that this apparent contradiction, which arises from a use of the fragment given by Assemani, does not really exist, and that the MSS. of Bar-Hebraeus, which are accessible to us in England, continue the foregoing passage as follows: "And he (*i.e.*, Eusebius) confessed as a lover of truth that he took his cue from the labours of that man (*i.e.*, Ammonius). For Tatian, also the disciple of Justin, the Philosopher and Martyr, patched and composed the Gospel of the Combined, and because the sequence of Mark, Luke, and John was lost, he defined the ten Canons only," etc.[3]

The important question may still be put: Was the *Diatessaron* upon which Mar Ephrem commented really that of Tatian? The

[1] This is the rendering of Dr. Lightfoot, *Essays*, p. 280.

[2] Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.*, i. 57.

[3] *Contemp. Rev.*, Aug. 1893, p. 274 f. Mr. Harris quotes many Syriac writers showing use of Ephrem's Commentary. Cf. *Fragments of the Comment. of Ephrem Syrus*, 1895.

mere statement that it began with the sentence, "In the beginning was the Word," does not afford much help for identifying the special *Diatessaron*, because many other Harmonies may have adopted the same obviously appropriate opening ; and we must all the more regret that the *Diatessaron* which, according to the *Doctrine of Addai*, was publicly read at Edessa, is not more clearly identified, for it might naturally be the work upon which a Churchman of Edessa may have written a commentary.

So little is really known of the *Diatessaron* of Tatian that there is no certainty even as to the language in which it was composed. Zahn and the majority of modern critics are of opinion that the original was written in Syriac, but Harnack states strong reasons for maintaining a Greek original.

We now come to comparatively recent times. The Armenian monks of St. Lazaro published, in 1834, four volumes of translations into Armenian of works of Ephrem Syrus, which contained a Harmony of the Gospels apparently beginning with the passage John i. 1. Aucher, the editor of Ephrem, made a Latin translation of the Commentary in 1841, which, being amended by Professor Mösinger, was published in 1876.[1] This is said to be the commentary which Ephrem is reported to have written upon Tatian's *Diatessaron*. The editors state their opinion that the Armenian version was written about the fifth century, and that it is a translation from the Syriac. Zahn long ago pointed out that the Commentary is evidently based upon exegetical lectures, probably delivered to theological classes, perhaps the subsequent record of a student.[2] Ephrem, moreover, or the writer of the "Commentary," whoever he may be, never himself calls the work upon which he is commenting the *Diatessaron*, nor mentions Tatian, but sometimes *Scriptura*, and occasionally *Evangelium*. There is, in fact, nothing whatever apart from the tradition preserved by Bar-Salibi and the note of the translator, written long after the time of Ephrem, to indicate that this is a commentary upon the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. The order is not always the same in the passages selected for comment as that of the Harmony of Victor, or of the Arabic *Diatessaron*, of which we shall presently speak, and the texts of all have been so manipulated that no literal importance can be attached to them.

We may now conveniently return to the Latin Harmony of Victor of Capua. It will be remembered that he was completely in doubt as to the authorship of the compilation which had come

[1] This work did not come to notice in this country till after the complete edition of *S. R.* was published in 1879, and of course we need not add that the still later works presently to be noticed could not before be discussed.

[2] *Forsch.*, p. 51 ; Resch, *Aussercan. Parallel-texte*, p. 43.

in his way, and as to whether he should ascribe it to Ammonius or to Tatian. Finally, upon mere conjecture, he decided in favour of Tatian. Regarding this Dr. Hemphill writes: -

"Victor of Capua himself is an important witness; for he was skilled in both Greek and Latin, and was a man of considerable eminence as a scholar and controversialist. And his solitary reason for attributing his discovery to Tatian is that he found one passage in Eusebius which spoke of Tatian having compiled a patchwork Gospel, which he judged to be the same, substantially, as that which accidentally came into his hands. Not one other allusion to Tatian's work does Victor mention; and the conclusion is that, but for the statement of Eusebius, he would have remained perfectly ignorant that such a work had ever existed.....The Latin Harmony, as it now exists in the *Codex Fuldensis*, represents not the harmony as it was found by Victor, but the Harmony as it was modified and edited under his direction. The index, which somehow escaped revision, does not in all cases agree with the body of the Codex, from which we gather that the latter may have been to some extent changed in order, and interpolated as in the case of the genealogies; while the text which Victor found has been changed piece by piece into the Vulgate of St. Jerome."[1]

Victor, making perfectly free use of the Latin Harmony which he had found, and altering it to suit his orthodox views, had it transcribed, and his fine manuscript has come down to us in the *Codex Fuldensis*, which is admitted to be almost the best authority for the text of the Vulgate version of the Gospels. It is no evidence, however, for the text of Tatian's *Diatessaron*, with which, in the first place, it cannot be identified, and to which, if it could, it no longer bears any likeness.

It must be apparent that the theory that the original of this Harmony, which was done into Latin, was that of Tatian, and not the *Diatessaron* of Ammonius or some one else who may have compiled a *Diatessaron* in the course of the four centuries between Tatian and Victor, rests upon a most unsubstantial basis. The most striking characteristic of Tatian's work, as we have seen, was the omission of the genealogies, an omission which led to its being anathematised by the Church. In the index which is cited to prove that the original Latin Harmony began with John i. 1 we also find the genealogy, *V. de generatione vel nativitate Christi.* It is not possible, upon any real grounds of evidence, to identify this Harmony with the *Diatessaron* of Tatian.

We now come to the last and most important document connected with this discussion. It had long been known that an Arabic manuscript existed in the Vatican Library purporting to be the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. This work, which had been brought to the library by Joseph Assemani, is described by him as *Tatiani Diatessaron seu quatuor Evangelia in unum redacta.*[2] It did not

[1] Hemphill, *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, pp. xi., xxiv. f.
[2] *Bibl. Orient.*, i. 619.

attract any attention till some years ago, when Agostino Ciasca, in 1883, published a pamphlet describing it, promising at some future time, if possible, to publish the manuscript. He did not find an opportunity of doing so, nor did Lagarde, who also thought of attempting it, till 1888, when Ciasca was able to produce an edition of the *Diatessaron* based upon this manuscript (XIV.), and a still more perfect one, which was presented to the Borgian Library in 1886 by Catholic Copts in Egypt, with a Latin translation by himself.[1] The latter manuscript, generally called the Borgian Codex, contains notes at the beginning and end, stating that this is a translation of Tatian's *Diatessaron* from a Syriac manuscript written by Isa ibn Ali el Mutatabbib, a disciple of Honain ibn Ishaq, by Abû-l-Faraj Abdullah Ibn-at-Tayyib. Honain is believed to have died A.D. 873, and the death of Abdullah Ibn-at-Tayyib is set down by Bar-Hebræus as having taken place A.D. 1043. The existing manuscript is assigned to the fourteenth century. The Syriac manuscript was, therefore, written seven centuries after Tatian's time, and the Arabic translation made some nine centuries after it. Beyond the notes of the scribe, we have no external evidence that the original *Diatessaron* was the work ascribed to Tatian and, as has already been fully stated, nothing could be more difficult than the identification of an anonymous compilation of this kind.

So little does the Arabic Harmony agree with what we are actually told of the *Diatessaron* of Tatian that elaborate explanation and conjecture are necessary to support the statement of the Arab translator or scribe that we have here that mysterious work. The *Diatessaron* of Tatian was said to have commenced with the passage: "In the beginning was the Word." Now, in the Vatican MS. XIV. the *Diatessaron* does not begin with these words, but with the opening words of the second Synoptic, "The Gospel of Jesus, the Son of the living God." This formerly convinced scholars that the Arabic Harmony was not that of Tatian, but Ciasca suggested that the words from Mark were added by another hand to supply the lack of a title. When the Borgian manuscript arrived, it was found that the introductory words from the second Synoptic are separated by a space from the text which follows. Which of these was the original form of the work from which the Arabic version was made cannot now be determined, or whether the separation in the Borgian manuscript was the result of a preconceived theory that the Harmony, being understood to be Tatian's, ought to open with the words of the fourth Gospel. Then the fact which we learn from Theodoret, that the genealogies and the passages showing Jesus to have been born of the seed of

[1] *Tatiani Evangeliorum Harmoniæ Arabice.*

David, after the flesh, were omitted from the *Diatessaron*, in consequence of which he resorted to the strong measure of "putting away" a couple of hundred copies of the work, is a still stronger obstacle to the identification of the Arabic Harmony with it, for these passages (Matt. i. 1–17 and Luke iii. 23 38) are contained in MS. XIV. In the Borgian manuscript, however, these genealogies are removed from the text and put as an appendix, under the title, "The Book of the Generation of Jesus." It is argued from this that we have here the passages in the first stage of insertion –they have got into the appendix on their way into the text. But may it not with greater probability be argued that they are in the first stage of omission—excluded from an inconvenient position in the text, where they clashed with the theory of the Harmony being by Tatian, and relegated to the appendix by the translators, who did not like to go so far as to exclude such scriptural matter altogether? One fact which seems to support the latter view is that in the index to the Latin Harmony of Victor—which Zahn regards as representative of the original Latin version of a Syriac *Diatessaron* which became transformed into the *Codex Fuldensis*—the fifth chapter is given as "*de generatione vel nativitate Christi*." In connection with these difficulties it must never be forgotten that, to identify the Arabic Harmony with the work of Tatian, we have really nothing but the note of almost unknown Arab scholars, writing nearly a thousand years after the time of Tatian, of a work which had no specific mark of authorship.

Another indication may be given, valuable in the almost complete absence of information regarding Tatian's *Diatessaron*, which likewise opposes the identification of the Arabic Harmony with that work. Dean Burgon[1] quotes an ancient Scholion which he met with while examining the Harleian manuscript 5,647 (of Evan. 72, published by Wetstein), which states that, in Tatian's *Diatessaron*, the verse of the fourth Gospel, "And another took a spear and pierced his side, and there came out water and blood," was inserted in Matt. xxvii. 48, and the writer adds that it is also introduced into the Evangelical History of Diodorus and divers other Holy Fathers, and "this also Chrysostom says." The only one of these assertions which can be tested now is that regarding Chrysostom, and it is found to be correct, for in Homily 88 the text occurs against a clear summary of v. 48. Now, this is not found either in the *Codex Fuldensis* or in the Arabic *Diatessaron*.

The doubts which exist as to the identification of these MSS. with the *Diatessaron* of Tatian are intensified when we consider

[1] *Last Twelve Verses of St. Mark*, 1871, p. 316 f.

the text of these works. If the identification were complete and decisive upon other grounds of evidence, it might be unnecessary to enter upon this part of the subject, but the changes which have taken place in the centuries which have passed since the compilation of the *Diatessaron* are so indicative of the tendency to adjust facts to agreement with prevalent opinion that it is instructive to consider also this side of the case. In his work on the *Diatessaron*, Mr. Rendel Harris frankly says: "From what has been said, it will be seen that, in describing the manuscripts from which Ciasca's text is made, we have been careful to avoid the assumption that the text of the Arabic Harmony is necessarily and at all points identical with that of the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. For, even if we accept the Harmony as Tatian's on the ground of its general agreements with the traditional Tatian, we are obliged to note in the manuscripts themselves a tendency to change in the most striking Tatian characteristics; and further, since the Harmony is substantially a New Testament manuscript, it is impossible that it could have remained in circulation without being affected by the same causes which were in operation to change the form of every successive recension of the New Testament into agreement with the latest recension of all."[1] Harnack considers that the Syriac manuscript from which the Arabic translation was made contained an already manipulated Catholic *Diatessaron*,[2] and elsewhere he says: "In all cases where I have referred to the Arabic Harmony—that is to say, at the passages characteristic of the real Tatian—the characteristic had been removed and the commonplace substituted." Resch, speaking of all these supposed representations of the *Diatessaron*, after pointing out the effect of the establishment of the canonical text, as the only authority, in producing a process of fundamental extirpation (*gründlicher Ausrottungs process*) of pre-canonical Gospel texts, says: "In consequence of this, the *Diatessaron* belongs to the number of wholly lost writings. Neither Greek nor Syriac copies of this oldest Gospel Harmony have been preserved," and he only regards Ephrem, Aphraates, the *Codex Fuldensis*, and the Arabic Harmony as sources for a partial reconstruction.[3] Zahn's opinion of the text is not a whit more favourable. It will be remembered that he said of the Latin Tatian that "the translation, if we can so call it, has been made in such a way that the fragments from which the Syriac book was compiled were sought for in the Latin Bible in the version of Jerome, and transcribed from it. It is equally clear," he continues, "that either on the occasion of the

[1] *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, 1890, p. 9.
[2] *Gesch. d. altchr. Lit.*, 1893, i., p. 495.
[3] *Aussercan. paralleltexte zu d. Ev.*, 1893, p. 42 f.

translation from Syriac into Latin, or even previously in the Syriac text itself which the Latinist had before him, the literary composition of the *Diatessaron* had undergone a profound transformation. All this and much more," he adds, "may also have occurred when the *Diatessaron* was translated into Arabic."[1]

When we consider the slightness of the evidence upon which any identification of these works with the *Diatessaron* of Tatian rests, this final judgment on the transformation of the text itself forms a suitable illustration of the whole position of the question. If many are content to consider the identity of the works settled, at least it is pretty certain that, if Tatian himself were to-day to see his *Diatessaron* as it stands in Ciasca's MS., he could not recognise his own work.

We have thought it desirable to state the case for Tatian's *Diatessaron* with sufficient fulness, as interesting in itself and important for a just appreciation of the difficulties which surround it; but so far as our special investigation is concerned a final judgment is simple and conclusive. Even if it be accepted that, towards the last quarter of the second century, Tatian possessed and made use of our Gospels, the fact can only prove the existence of those writings, but adds nothing to our knowledge of their authors, and certainly does not in the least justify us in accepting them as adequate witnesses for miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation.

Dionysius of Corinth need not detain us long. Eusebius informs us that he was the author of seven Epistles addressed to various Christian communities, and also of a letter to Chrysophora, "a most faithful sister." Eusebius speaks of these writings as Catholic Epistles, and briefly characterises each; but, with the exception of a few short fragments preserved by him, none of these fruits of the "inspired industry" (*ἐνθέου φιλοπονίας*) of Dionysius are now extant.[2] These fragments are all from an Epistle said to have been addressed to Soter, Bishop of Rome, and give us a clue to the time at which they were written. The Bishopric of Soter is generally dated between A.D. 168–176,[3] during which years the Epistle must have been composed. It could not have been written, however, before Dionysius became Bishop of Corinth in A.D. 170,[4] and it was probably written some years after.[5]

[1] *Gesch. des N. T. Kanons*, 1891, ii., p. 533 f.

[2] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 23; Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 27; Grabe, *Spicil. Patr.*, ii., p. 217 f.; Routh, *Reliq. Sacræ*, i., p. 180 ff.

[3] Eusebius, in his *Chronicon*, sets it in A.D. 171. [4] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 19.

[5] Anger places it between 173–177, *Synops. Ev. Prolegg.*, xxxii.: cf. Credner, *Gesch. N. T. Kan.*, p. 79. Jerome states that Dionysius flourished under M. Aurel. Verus and L. Aurel. Commodus (*De Vir. Ill.*, 27).

No quotation from, or allusion to, any writing of the New Testament occurs in any of the fragments of the Epistles now extant; nor does Eusebius make mention of any such reference in the Epistles which have perished. As testimony for our Gospels, therefore, Dionysius is an absolute blank. Some expressions and statements, however, are put forward by apologists which we must examine. In the few lines which Tischendorf accords to Dionysius he refers to two of these. The first is an expression used, not by Dionysius himself, but by Eusebius, in speaking of the Epistles to the Churches at Amastris and at Pontus. Eusebius says that Dionysius adds some "expositions of Divine Scriptures" (*γραφῶν θείων ἐξηγήσεις*).[1] There can be no doubt, we think, that this refers to the Old Testament only, and Tischendorf himself does not deny it.[2]

The second passage which Tischendorf[3] points out, and which he claims with some other apologists as evidence of the actual existence of a New Testament Canon when Dionysius wrote, occurs in a fragment from the Epistle to Soter and the Romans which is preserved by Eusebius. It is as follows: "For the brethren having requested me to write Epistles, I wrote them. And the Apostles of the devil have filled these with tares, both taking away parts and adding others; for whom the woe is destined. It is not surprising, then, if some have recklessly ventured to adulterate the Scriptures of the Lord (*τῶν κυριακῶν γραφῶν*) when they have formed designs against these which are not of such importance."[4] Regarding this passage, Dr. Westcott, with his usual boldness, says: "It is evident that the 'Scriptures of the Lord'—the writings of the New Testament—were at this time collected, that they were distinguished from other books, that they were jealously guarded, that they had been corrupted for heretical purposes."[5] We have seen, however, that there has not been a trace of any New Testament Canon in the

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 23.

[2] Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 18 f.; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 38; Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 217. Dr. Westcott's opinion is shown by his not even referring to the expression.

[3] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 18 f.

[4] *H. E.*, iv. 23.

[5] *On the Canon*, p. 166. Dr. Westcott, in the first instance, translates the expression, *τῶν κυριακῶν γραφῶν*: "The Scriptures of the New Testament." In a note to his fourth edition, however, he explains: "Of course, it is not affirmed that the collection here called *αἱ κυριακαὶ γραφαί* was identical with our 'New Testament,' but simply that the phrase shows that a collection of writings belonging to the New Testament existed" (p. 188, n. 2). Such a translation, in such a work, assuming, as it does, the whole question, and concealing what is doubtful, is most unwarrantable. The fact is that not only is there no mention of the New Testament at all, but the words as little necessarily imply a "collection" of writings as they do a "collection" of the Epistles of Dionysius.

writings of the Fathers before and during this age, and it is not permissible to put such an interpretation upon the remark of Dionysius. Dr. Donaldson, with greater critical justice and reserve, remarks regarding the expression, "Scriptures of the Lord": "It is not easy to settle what this term means," although he adds his own personal opinion, "but most probably it refers to the Gospels as containing the sayings and doings of the Lord. It is not likely, as Lardner supposes, that such a term would be applied to the whole of the New Testament."[1] The idea of our collected New Testament being referred to is of course quite untenable, and although it is open to argument that Dionysius may have referred to evangelical works, it is obvious that there are no means of proving the fact, and much less that he referred specially to our Gospels. In fact, the fragments of Dionysius present no evidence whatever of the existence of our Synoptics.

In order further to illustrate the inconclusiveness of the arguments based upon so vague an expression, we may add that it does not of necessity apply to any Gospels or works of Christian history at all, and may with perfect propriety have indicated the Scriptures of the Old Testament. We find Justin Martyr complaining in the same spirit as Dionysius, through several chapters, that the Old Testament Scriptures, and more especially those relating to the Lord, had been adulterated, that parts had been taken away, and others added, with the intention of destroying or weakening their application to Christ.[2] Justin's argument throughout is, that the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures refer to Christ; and Tryphon, his antagonist, the representative of Jewish opinion, is made to avow that the Jews not only wait for Christ, but, he adds, "We admit that all the Scriptures which you have cited refer to him."[3] Not only, therefore, were the Scriptures of the Old Testament closely connected with their Lord by the Fathers and, at the date of which we are treating, were the only "Holy Scriptures" recognised, but they made the same complaints which we meet with in Dionysius, that these Scriptures were adulterated by omissions and interpolations.[4] The expression of Eusebius regarding "expositions of Divine Scriptures" (*γραφῶν θείων ἐξηγήσεις*) added by Dionysius, which applied to the Old Testament, tends to connect the Old Testament also with this term, "Scriptures of the Lord."

If the term, "Scriptures of the Lord," however, be referred to Gospels, the difficulty of using it as evidence continues undiminished. We have no indication of the particular evangelical works

[1] *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 217.
[2] *Dial. c. Tryph.*, lxx.–lxxv. [3] *Dial.* lxxxix.
[4] This charge is made with insistence throughout the *Clementine Homilies*.

which were in the Bishop's mind. We have seen that other Gospels were used by the Fathers, and in exclusive circulation amongst various communities; and even until much later times many works were regarded by them as divinely inspired which have no place in our Canon. The Gospel according to the Hebrews, for instance, was probably used by some at least of the Apostolic Fathers, by pseudo-Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, Hegesippus, Justin Martyr, and at least employed along with our Gospels by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Jerome.[1] The fact that Serapion, in the third century, allowed the Gospel of Peter to be used in the church of Rhossus[2] shows at the same time the consideration in which it was held, and the incompleteness of the canonical position of the New Testament writings. So does the circumstance that in the fifth century Theodoret found the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or Tatian's Gospel, widely circulated and held in honour amongst orthodox churches in his diocese.[3] The Shepherd of Hermas, which was read in the churches and nearly secured a permanent place in the Canon, was quoted as inspired by Irenæus.[4] The Epistle of Barnabas was held in similar honour, and quoted as inspired by Clement of Alexandria[5] and by Origen,[6] as was likewise the Epistle of the Roman Clement. The Apocalypse of Peter was included by Clement of Alexandria in his account of the canonical Scriptures and those which are disputed, such as the Epistle of Jude and the other Catholic Epistles,[7] and it stands side by side with the Apocalypse of John in the Canon of Muratori, being long after publicly read in the churches of Palestine.[8] Tischendorf, indeed, conjectures that a blank in the *Codex Sinaiticus*, after the New Testament, was formerly filled by it. Justin, Clement of Alexandria, and Lactantius quote the Sibylline books as the Word of God, and pay similar honour to the Book of Hystaspes.[9] So great indeed was the consideration and use of the Sibylline Books in the Church of the second and third centuries that Christians from that fact were nicknamed Sibyllists.[10] It is unnecessary to multiply, as might so easily be done, these illustrations; it is sufficiently well

[1] Cf. p. 263 f.
[2] Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi. 12.
[3] Theodoret, *Hær. Fab.*, i. 20; cf. ii. 2; cf. Epiph., *Hær.*, xlvi. 1.
[4] *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 20, § 2; Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 8; cf. iii. 3.
[5] *Strom.*, ii. 8, iv. 17.
[6] *Philocal.*, 18.
[7] Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi. 14
[8] Sozom, *H. E.*, vii. 19.
[9] Justin, *Apol.*, i. 20, 44; Clem. Al., *Strom.*, vi. 5, §§ 42, 43; Lactantius, *Instit. Div.*, i. 6, 7, vii. 15, 19. Clement of Alexandria quotes with perfect faith and seriousness some apocryphal book, in which, he says, the Apostle Paul recommends the Hellenic books, the Sibyl and the books of Hystaspes, as giving notably clear prophetic descriptions of the Son of God (*Strom.*, vi. 5, § 42, 43).
[10] Origen, *Contra Cels.*, v. 6; cf. vii. 53.

known that a number of Gospels and similar works, which have been excluded from the Canon, were held in deepest veneration by the Church in the second century, to which the words of Dionysius may apply. So vague and indefinite an expression, at any rate, is useless as evidence for the existence of our canonical Gospels.

Dr. Westcott's deduction from the words of Dionysius, that not only were the writings of the New Testament already collected, but that they were "jealously guarded," is imaginative indeed. It is much and devoutly to be wished that they had been as carefully guarded as he supposes; but it is well known that this was not the case, and that numerous interpolations have been introduced into the text. The whole history of the Canon and of Christian literature in the second and third centuries displays the most deplorable carelessness and want of critical judgment on the part of the Fathers. Whatever was considered as conducive to Christian edification was blindly adopted by them, and a number of works were launched into circulation and falsely ascribed to Apostles and others likely to secure for them greater consideration. Such pious fraud was rarely suspected, still more rarely detected in the early ages of Christianity, and several of such pseudographs have secured a place in our New Testament. The words of Dionysius need not receive any wider signification than a reference to well-known Epistles. It is clear from the words attributed to the Apostle Paul, in 2 Thess. ii. 2, iii. 17, that his Epistles were falsified and, setting aside some of those which bear his name in our Canon, spurious Epistles were long ascribed to him, such as the Epistle to the Laodiceans and a third Epistle to the Corinthians. We need not do more than allude to the second Epistle falsely bearing the name of Clement of Rome, as well as the *Clementine Homilies* and *Recognitions*, the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and the spurious letters of Ignatius, the letters and legend of Abgarus quoted by Eusebius, and the Epistles of Paul and Seneca, in addition to others already pointed out, as instances of the wholesale falsification of that period, many of which gross forgeries were at once accepted as genuine by the Fathers, so slight was their critical faculty and so ready their credulity.[1] In one case the Church punished the author who, from mistaken zeal for the honour of the Apostle Paul, fabricated the *Acta Pauli et Theclæ* in his name,[2] but the forged production was not the less made use of in the Church. There was, therefore, no lack of falsification and adulteration of works of Apostles and others of greater note than himself to warrant the remark of Dionysius,

[1] The Epistle of Jude quotes as genuine the Assumption of Moses, and also the Book of Enoch; and the defence of the authenticity of the latter by Tertullian (*de Cultu fem.*, i. 3) will not be forgotten. [2] Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, 17.

without any forced application of it to our Gospels or to a New Testament Canon, the existence of which there is nothing to substantiate, but, on the contrary, every reason to discredit.

Before leaving this passage we may add that, although even Tischendorf does not, Dr. Westcott does find in it references to our first Synoptic and to the Apocalypse. "The short fragment just quoted," he says, "contains two obvious allusions, one to the Gospel of St. Matthew and one to the Apocalypse."[1] The words, "the Apostles of the devil have filled these with tares," are, he supposes, an allusion to Matt. xiii. 24 ff. But even if the expression were an echo of the Parable of the Wheat and Tares, it is not permissible to refer it in this arbitrary way to our first Gospel, to the exclusion of the numerous other works which existed, many of which doubtless contained it. Obviously the words have no evidential value.

Continuing his previous assertions, however, Dr. Westcott affirms with equal boldness: "The allusion in the last clause"—to the "Scriptures of the Lord"—"will be clear when it is remembered that Dionysius 'warred against the heresy of Marcion and defended the rule of truth'" (*παρίστασθαι κανόνι ἀλ.*).[2] Tischendorf, who is ready enough to strain every expression into evidence, recognises too well that this is not capable of such an interpretation. Dr. Westcott omits to mention that the words, moreover, are not used by Dionysius at all, but simply proceed from Eusebius.[3] Dr. Donaldson distinctly states the fact that "there is no reference to the Bible in the words of Eusebius: he defends the rule of the truth"[4] (*τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας παρίσταται κανόνι*).

There is only one other point to mention. Dr. Westcott refers to the passage in the Epistle of Dionysius, which has already been quoted in this work, regarding the reading of Christian writings in churches. "To-day," he writes to Soter, "we have kept the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your Epistle, from the reading of which we shall ever derive admonition, as we do from the former one written to us by Clement."[5] It is evident that there was no idea, in selecting the works to be read at the weekly assembly of Christians, of any Canon of a New Testament. We here learn that the Epistles of Clement and of Soter were habitually read; and, while we hear of this and of the similar reading of Justin's *Memoirs of the Apostles*,[6] of the *Shepherd* of Hermas,[7] of the Apocalypse of Peter,[8] and other apocryphal works, we do not at the same time hear of the public reading of our Gospels.

[1] *On the Canon*, p. 167. [2] *Ib.*, p. 166 f. [3] *H. E.*, iv. 23.
[4] *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 217 f. [5] Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 23.
[6] Justin, *Apol.*, i. 67. [7] Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 3; Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 10.
[8] Sozom., *H. E.*, vii. 9.

CHAPTER IX.

MELITO OF SARDIS—CLAUDIUS APOLLINARIS—ATHENAGORAS—THE EPISTLE OF VIENNE AND LYONS

We might altogether have passed over Melito, Bishop of Sardis, in Lydia, had it not been for the use of certain fragments of his writings made by Dr. Westcott. Melito, naturally, is not cited by Tischendorf at all, but the English apologist, with greater zeal, we think, than critical discretion, forces him into service as evidence for the Gospels and a New Testament Canon. The date of Melito, it is generally agreed, falls after A.D. 176, a phrase in his apology presented to Marcus Antoninus preserved in Eusebius[1] (*μετὰ τοῦ παιδός*) indicating that Commodus had already been admitted to a share of the Government.

Dr. Westcott affirms that, in a fragment preserved by Eusebius, Melito speaks of the books of the New Testament in a collected form. He says: "The words of Melito on the other hand are simple and casual, and yet their meaning can scarcely be mistaken. He writes to Onesimus, a fellow-Christian, who had urged him 'to make selections for him from the Law and the Prophets concerning the Saviour and the faith generally, and furthermore desired to learn the accurate account of the Old (*παλαιῶν*) Books': 'having gone therefore to the East,' Melito says, 'and reached the spot where [each thing] was preached and done, and having learned accurately the Books of the Old Testament, I have sent a list of them.' The mention of 'the Old Books'—'the Books of the Old Testament,' naturally implies a definite New Testament, a written antitype to the Old; and the form of language implies a familiar recognition of its contents."[2] This is truly astonishing! The "form of language" can only refer to the words, "concerning the Saviour and the faith generally," which must have an amazing fulness of meaning to convey to Dr. Westcott the implication of a "familiar recognition" of the contents of a supposed already collected New Testament, seeing that a simple Christian, not to say a Bishop, might at least know of a Saviour and the faith generally from the oral preaching of the Gospel, from

[1] *H. E.*, iv. 26.

[2] *On the Canon*, p. 193. (In the fourth edition Dr. Westcott omits the last phrase, making a full stop at "Old," p. 218.)

a single Epistle of Paul, or from any of the πολλοί of Luke. This reasoning forms a worthy pendant to his argument, that because Melito speaks of the books of the Old Testament he implies the existence of a definite collected New Testament. Such an assertion is calculated to mislead a large class of readers.[1]

The fragment of Melito is as follows: "Melito to his brother Onesimus, greeting. As thou hast frequently desired in thy zeal for the word (λόγον) to have extracts made for thee, both from the law and the prophets concerning the Saviour and our whole faith; nay, more, hast wished to learn the exact statement of the old books (παλαιῶν βιβλίων), how many they are and what is their order, I have earnestly endeavoured to accomplish this, knowing thy zeal concerning the faith, and thy desire to be informed concerning the word (λόγον), and especially that thou preferrest these matters to all others from love towards God, striving to gain eternal salvation. Having, therefore, gone to the East, and reached the place where this was preached and done, and having accurately ascertained the books of the Old Testament (τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία), I have, subjoined, sent a list of them unto thee, of which these are the names"—then follows a list of the books of the Old Testament, omitting, however, Esther. He then concludes with the words: "Of these I have made the extracts, dividing them into six books."[2]

Dr. Westcott's assertion that the expression, "Old Books," "Books of the Old Testament," involves here by antithesis a definite *written* New Testament, requires us to say a few words as to the name of "Testament" as applied to both divisions of the Bible. It is of course well known that this word came into use originally from the translation of the Hebrew word "covenant," or compact made between God and the Israelites,[3] in the Septuagint version, by the Greek word Διαθήκη, which in a legal sense also means a will or testament,[4] and that word is adopted throughout the New Testament.[5] The Vulgate translation, instead of retaining the original Hebrew signification, translated

[1] It must be said, however, that Dr. Westcott merely follows and exaggerates Lardner here, who says: "From this passage I would conclude that there was then also a volume or collection of books called the New Testament, containing the writings of Apostles and Apostolical men; but we cannot from hence infer the names or the exact number of those books" (*Credibility*, etc., *Works*, ii., p. 148).

[2] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 26.

[3] Cf. Exod. xxiv. 7.

[4] The legal sense of διαθήκη as a Will or Testament is distinctly intended in Heb. ix. 16. "For where a Testament (διαθήκη) is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator" (διαθεμένου). The same word διαθήκη is employed throughout the whole passage (Heb. ix. 15–23).

[5] 2 Cor. iii. 14; Heb. viii. 6–13, xii. 24; Rom. ix. 4, xi. 26–28; Gal. iii. 14–17; Ephes. ii. 12, etc.

the word in the Gospels and Epistles, "*Testamentum*," and ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη became "*Vetus Testamentum*," instead of "*Vetus Fœdus*," and whenever the word occurs in the English version it is almost invariably rendered "Testament" instead of covenant. The expression "Book of the Covenant," or "Testament," βίβλος τῆς διαθήκης, frequently occurs in the LXX version of the Old Testament and its Apocrypha;[1] and in Jeremiah xxxi. 31-34[2] the prophet speaks of making a "new covenant" (καινὴ διαθήκη) with the house of Israel, which is indeed quoted in Hebrews viii. 8. It is the doctrinal idea of the new covenant, through Christ confirming the former one made to the Israelites, which has led to the distinction of the Old and New Testaments. Generally the Old Testament was, in the first ages of Christianity, indicated by the simple expressions, "The Books" (τὰ βιβλία), "Holy Scriptures" (ἱερὰ γράμματα,[3] or γραφαὶ ἁγίαι),[4] or "The Scriptures" (αἱ γραφαί);[5] but the preparation for the distinction of "Old Testament" began very early in the development of the doctrinal idea of the New Testament of Christ, before there was any part of the New Testament books written at all. The expression "New Testament," derived thus antithetically from the "Old Testament," occurs constantly throughout the second part of the Bible. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, viii. 6–13, the Mosaic dispensation is contrasted with the Christian, and Jesus is called the Mediator of a better Testament (διαθήκη).[6] The first Testament, not being faultless, is replaced by the second, and the writer quotes the passage from Jeremiah to which we have referred regarding a New Testament, winding up his argument with the words, v. 13: "In that he saith a new (Testament) he hath made the first old." Again, in our first Gospel, during the Last Supper, Jesus is represented as saying: "This is my blood of the New Testament" (τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης);[7] and in Luke he says: "This cup is the New Testament (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη) in my blood."[8] There is, therefore, a very distinct reference made to the two Testaments as "New" and "Old," and in speaking of the books of the Law and the Prophets as the "Old Books" and "Books of the Old Testament," after the general acceptance of the Gospel of Jesus as the New Testament or Covenant, there was no antithetical implication of a written New Testament, but a mere reference to the doctrinal idea. We might multiply illustrations showing how ever-present to the mind of the early Church was the

[1] Cf. Exod. xxiv. 7; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 30; 2 Kings xxiii. 2; 1 Maccab. i. 57; Sirach, xxiv. 23, etc.

[2] In the Septuagint version, xxxviii. 31–34.

[3] 2 Tim. iii. 15.

[4] Rom. i. 2.

[5] Matt. xxii. 29.

[6] Cf. ix. 15, xii. 24.

[7] Matt. xxvi. 28.

[8] Luke xxii. 20.

contrast of the Mosaic and Christian Covenants as Old and New. Two more we may venture to point out. In Romans ix. 4 and Gal. iv. 24 the two Testaments or Covenants (*αἱ δύο διαθῆκαι*), typified by Sinai and the heavenly Jerusalem, are discussed, and the superiority of the latter asserted. There is, however, a passage still more clear and decisive. Paul says in 2 Corinthians iii. 6: "Who also (God) made us sufficient to be ministers of the New Testament (*καινῆς διαθήκης*), not of the letter, but of the spirit" (*οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος*). Why does not Dr. Westcott boldly claim this as evidence of a definite written New Testament, when not only is there reference to the name, but a distinction drawn between the letter and the spirit of it, from which an apologist might make a telling argument? But, proceeding to contrast the glory of the New with the Old dispensation, the Apostle, in reference to the veil with which Moses covered his face, says: "But their understandings were hardened: for until this very day remaineth the same veil in the reading of the Old Testament" (*ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης*);[1] and as if to make the matter still clearer he repeats in the next verse: "But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil lieth upon their heart." Now, here the actual reading of the *Old* Testament (*παλαιᾶς διαθήκης*) is distinctly mentioned, and the expression, quite as aptly as that of Melito, "implies a definite New Testament, a written antitype to the Old": but even Dr. Westcott would not dare to suggest that, when the second Epistle to the Corinthians was composed, there was a "definite written New Testament" in existence. This conclusively shows that the whole argument from Melito's mention of the books of the Old Testament is absolutely groundless.

On the contrary, the first general designation for the two portions of the New Testament collection was "The Gospel" (*εὐαγγέλιον, εὐαγγελικόν, εὐαγγελικά*) and "The Apostle" (*ἀπόστολος, ἀποστολικόν, ἀποστολικά*), in contrast with the two divisions of the Old Testament, the Law and the Prophets (*ὁ νόμος, οἱ προφῆται*);[2] and the name New Testament occurs for the very first time in the third century, when Tertullian called the collection of Christian Scriptures *Novum*

[1] Verse 14.

[2] Cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 3, § 6; Clemens Al., *Strom.*, v. 5, § 31; Tertullian, *De Præscr.*, 36; *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 2, *Apolog.*, 18; Origen, *Hom.* xix. in *Jerem.* iii., p. 364. The Canon of Muratori says that the Pastor of Hermas can neither be classed "*inter Prophetas neque inter Apostolos.*" In a translation of the *Clavis*, a spurious work attributed to Melito himself—and Dr. Westcott admits it to be spurious (p. 198, note 1)—the Gospels are referred to simply by the formula "*in evangelio*," and the Epistles generally "*in apostolo.*"

Instrumentum and *Novum Testamentum.*[1] The term ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη is not, so far as we are aware, applied in the Greek to the "New Testament" Scriptures in any earlier work than Origen's *De Principiis*, iv. 1. It was only in the second half of the third century that the double designation τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος was generally abandoned.

As to the evidence for a New Testament Canon, which Dr. Westcott supposes he gains by his unfounded inference from Melito's expression, we may judge of its value from the fact that he himself, like Lardner, admits: "But there is little evidence in the fragment of Melito to show what writings he would have included in the new collection."[2] Little evidence? There is none at all.

There is, however, one singular and instructive point in this fragment to which Dr. Westcott does not in any way refer, but which well merits attention as illustrating the state of religious knowledge at that time and, by analogy, giving a glimpse of the difficulties which beset early Christian literature. We are told by Melito that Onesimus had frequently urged him to give him exact information as to the number and order of the books of the Old Testament, and to have extracts made for him from them concerning the Saviour and the faith. Now, it is apparent that Melito, though a Bishop, was not able to give the desired information regarding the number and order of the books of the Old Testament himself, but that he had to make a journey to collect it. If this was the extent of knowledge possessed by the Bishop of Sardis of what was to the Fathers the only Holy Scripture, how ignorant his flock must have been, and how unfitted, both, to form any critical judgment as to the connection of Christianity with the Mosaic dispensation. The formation of a Christian Canon at a period when such ignorance was not only possible but generally prevailed, and when the zeal of believers led to the composition of such a mass of pseudonymic and other literature, in which every consideration of correctness and truth was subordinated to a childish desire for edification, must have been slow indeed and uncertain; and in such an age fortuitous circumstances must have mainly led to the canonisation or actual loss of many a work. So far from affording any evidence of the existence of a New Testament Canon, the fragment of Melito only shows the ignorance of the Bishop of Sardis as to the Canon even of the Old Testament.

We have not yet finished with Melito in connection with Dr.

[1] *Adv. Prax.*, 15, 20; *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 1. He says in the latter place "*instrumenti*," referring to Old and New Testaments, "*vel, quod magis usui est dicere, testamenti.*"

[2] *On the Canon*, p. 194.

Westcott, however, and it is necessary to follow him further in order fully to appreciate the nature of the evidence for the New Testament Canon, which, in default of better, he is obliged to offer. Eusebius gives a list of the works of Melito which have come to his knowledge, and, in addition to the fragment already quoted, he extracts a brief passage from Melito's work on the Passover, and some much longer quotations from his *Apology*, to which we have in passing referred.[1] With these exceptions, none of Melito's writings are now extant. Dr. Cureton, however, has published a Syriac version, with translation, of a so-called *Oration of Meliton, the Philosopher, who was in the Presence of Antoninus Cæsar*, together with five other fragments attributed to Melito.[2] With regard to this Syriac *Oration*, Dr. Westcott says: "Though, if it be entire, it is not the *Apology* with which Eusebius was acquainted, the general character of the writing leads to the belief that it is a genuine book of Melito of Sardis";[3] and he proceeds to treat it as authentic. In the first place, we have so little of Melito's genuine compositions extant that it is hazardous indeed to draw any positive deduction from the "character of the writing." Cureton, Bunsen, and others, maintain that this *Apology* is not a fragment; and it cannot be the work mentioned by Eusebius, for it does not contain the quotations from the authentic *Orations* which he has preserved, and which are considerable. It is, however, clear, from the substance of the composition, that it cannot have been spoken before the Emperor; and, moreover, it has in no way the character of an "apology," for there is not a single word in it about either Christianity or Christians. There is every reason to believe that it is not a genuine work of Melito. There is no ground for supposing that he wrote two *Apologies*, nor is this ascribed to him upon any other ground than the inscription of an unknown Syriac writer. This, however, is not the only spurious work attributed to Melito. Of this work Dr. Westcott says: "Like other *Apologies*, this oration contains only indirect references to the Christian Scriptures. The allusions in it to the Gospels are extremely rare, and, except so far as they show the influence of St. John's writings, of no special interest."[4] It would have been more correct to have said that there are no allusions in it to the Gospels at all.

Dr. Westcott is somewhat enthusiastic in speaking of Melito and his literary activity as evinced in the titles of his works recorded by Eusebius, and he quotes a fragment, said to be from

[1] Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 26.

[2] *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 1855, pp. 41-56; Pitra, *Spicil. Solesm.*, 1855, ii. *Proleg.*, xxxviii. f.

[3] *On the Canon*, p. 194.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 194.

a treatise, *On Faith*, amongst these Syriac remains, and which he considers to be "a very striking expansion of the early historic creed of the Church."[1] As usual, we shall give the entire fragment :—

"We have made collections from the Law and the Prophets relative to those things which have been declared respecting our Lord Jesus Christ, that we may prove to your love that he is perfect Reason, the Word of God ; who was begotten before the light ; who was Creator together with the Father ; who was the Fashioner of man ; who was all in all ; who among the Patriarchs was Patriarch ; who in the Law was the Law ; among the Priests chief Priest ; among Kings Governor ; among the Prophets the Prophet ; among the Angels Archangel ; in the voice the Word ; among Spirits Spirit ; in the Father the Son ; in God the King for ever and ever. For this was he who was Pilot to Noah ; who conducted Abraham ; who was bound with Isaac ; who was in exile with Jacob ; who was sold with Joseph ; who was captain with Moses ; who was the Divider of the inheritance with Jesus the son of Nun ; who in David and the Prophets foretold his own sufferings ; who was incarnate in the Virgin ; who was born at Bethlehem ; who was wrapped in swaddling clothes in the manger ; who was seen of shepherds ; who was glorified of angels ; who was worshipped by the Magi ; who was pointed out by John ; who assembled the Apostles ; who preached the kingdom ; who healed the maimed ; who gave light to the blind ; who raised the dead ; who appeared in the Temple ; who was not believed by the people ; who was betrayed by Judas ; who was laid hold of by the priests ; who was condemned by Pilate ; who was pierced in the flesh ; who was hanged upon the tree ; who was buried in the earth ; who rose from the dead ; who appeared to the Apostles ; who ascended to heaven ; who sitteth on the right hand of the Father ; who is the Rest of those who are departed ; the Recoverer of those who are lost ; the Light of those who are in darkness ; the Deliverer of those who are captives ; the Finder of those who have gone astray ; the Refuge of the afflicted ; the Bridegroom of the Church ; the Charioteer of the Cherubim ; the Captain of the Angels ; God who is of God ; the Son who is of the Father ; Jesus Christ, the King for ever and ever. Amen."[2]

Dr. Westcott commences his commentary upon this passage with the remark : "No writer could state the fundamental truths of Christianity more unhesitatingly, or quote the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments with more perfect confidence."[3] We need not do more than remark that there is not a single quotation in the fragment, and that there is not a single one of the references to Gospel history or to ecclesiastical dogmas which might not have been derived from the Epistles of Paul, from any of the forms of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Protevangelium of James, or from many other apocryphal Gospels, or the oral teaching of the Church. It is singular, however, that the only hint which Dr. Westcott gives of the more than doubtful authenticity of this fragment consists of the introductory remark, after

[1] *On the Canon*, p. 196.

[2] Cureton, *Spicil. Syriacum*, p. 53 f. ; Pitra, *Spicil. Solesm.*, ii. *Proleg.* lix. f. ; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 196 f.

[3] *On the Canon*, p. 197.

alluding to the titles of his genuine and supposititious writings: "Of these multifarious writings very few fragments remain in the original Greek, but the general tone of them is so decided in its theological character as to go far to establish the genuineness of those which are preserved in the Syriac translation."[1]

Now, the fragment *On Faith* which has just been quoted is one of the five Syriac pieces of Dr. Cureton to which we have referred, and which even apologists agree "cannot be regarded as genuine."[2] It is well known that there were other writers in the early Church bearing the names of Melito and Miletius or Meletius, which were frequently confounded. Of these five Syriac fragments one bears the superscription, "Of Meliton, Bishop of the city of Attica," and another, "Of the holy Meliton, Bishop of Utica"; and Cureton himself evidently leant to the opinion that they are not by our Melito, but by a Meletius or Melitius, Bishop of Sebastopolis in Pontus.[3] The third fragment is said to be taken from a discourse, *On the Cross*, which was unknown to Eusebius, and from its doctrinal peculiarities was probably written after his time.[4] Another fragment purports to be from a work on the *Soul and Body*; and the last one from the treatise *On Faith*, which we are discussing. The last two works are mentioned by Eusebius, but these fragments, besides coming in such suspicious company, must for other reasons be pronounced spurious.[5] They have in fact no attestation whatever except that of the Syriac translator, who is unknown, and which therefore is worthless; and, on the other hand, the whole style and thought of the fragments are unlike anything else of Melito's time, and clearly indicate a later stage of theological development.[6] Moreover, in the Mechitarist Library at Venice there is a shorter version of the same passage in a Syriac MS., and an Armenian version of the extract as given above, with some variation of the opening lines, in both of which the passage is distinctly ascribed to Irenæus.[7] Besides the *Oration* and the five Syriac fragments, there are two other works extant falsely attributed to Melito, one, *De Transitu Virginis Mariæ*, describing the miraculous presence of the Apostles at the death of Mary;[8] and the other, *De Actibus Joannis Apostoli*, relates the history of miracles performed by the Apostle John. Both are universally admitted to be spurious, as are a few other fragments also bearing

[1] *On the Canon*, p. 196.
[2] Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 236; cf. Sanday, *Gospels in Sec. Cent.*, p. 245.
[3] *Spicil. Syriac.*, p. 96 f.
[4] Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 237.
[5] *Ib.*, iii., p. 227.
[6] *Ib.*, iii., p. 236.
[7] They are given by Pitra, *Spicil. Solesm.*, i., p. 3 f.
[8] It is worthy of remark that the Virgin is introduced into all these fragments in a manner quite foreign to the period at which Melito lived.

his name. Melito did not escape from the falsification to which many of his more distinguished predecessors and contemporaries were victims, through the literary activity and unscrupulous religious zeal of the first three or four centuries of our era.

Very little is known regarding Claudius Apollinaris, to whom we must now for a moment turn. Eusebius informs us that he was Bishop of Hierapolis,[1] and in this he is supported by the fragment of a letter of Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, preserved to us by him, which refers to Apollinaris as the "most blessed."[2] Tischendorf, without any precise date, sets him down as contemporary with Tatian and Theophilus (the latter of whom, he thinks, wrote his work addressed to Autolycus about A.D. 180–181).[3] Eusebius[4] mentions that, like his somewhat earlier contemporary, Melito of Sardis, Apollinaris presented an "Apology" to the Emperor Marcus Antoninus, and he gives us further materials for a date[5] by stating that Claudius Apollinaris, probably in his Apology, refers to the miracle of the "Thundering Legion," which is said to have occurred during the war of Marcus Antoninus against the Marcomanni in A.D. 174.[6] The date of his writings may, therefore, with moderation, be fixed between A.D. 177–180.

Eusebius and others mention various works composed by him,[7] none of which, however, are extant; and we have only to deal with two brief fragments in connection with the Paschal controversy, which are ascribed to Appollinaris in the *Paschal Chronicle* of Alexandria. This controversy as to the day upon which the Christian Passover should be celebrated broke out about A.D. 170, and long continued to divide the Church. In the preface to the *Paschal Chronicle*, a work of the seventh century, the unknown chronicler says: "Now, even Apollinaris, the most holy Bishop of Hierapolis, in Asia, who lived near apostolic times, taught the like things in his work on the Passover, saying

[1] *H. E.*, iv. 21, 26. [2] *Ib.*, v. 19.

[3] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 16, anm. 1.

[4] *H. E.*, iv. 26, 27; cf. Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 26.

[5] Eusebius himself sets him down in his Chronicle as flourishing in the eleventh year of Marcus, or A.D. 171, a year later than he dates Melito.

[6] Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 5; Moshiem, *Inst. Hist. Eccles.*, book i., cent. ii., part. i., ch. i., § 9. Apollinaris states that, in consequence of this miracle, the Emperor had bestowed upon the Legion the name of the "Thundering Legion." We cannot here discuss this subject, but the whole story illustrates the rapidity with which a fiction is magnified into truth by religious zeal, and is surrounded by false circumstantial evidence. Cf. Tertullian, *Apol.* 5, *ad Scapulam*, 4; Dion Cassius, *lib.* 55; Scaliger, *Animadv. in Euseb.*, p. 223 f.

[7] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 27; cf. 26, v. 19; Hieron., *Vir. Ill.*, 26; Theodoret, *Hær. Fab.*, ii. 21, iii. 2; Photius, *Biblioth. Cod.* 14.

thus: 'There are some, however, who, through ignorance, raise contentions regarding these matters in a way which should be pardoned, for ignorance does not admit of accusation, but requires instruction. And they say that the Lord, together with his disciples, ate the sheep (τό πρόβατον) on the 14th Nisan, but himself suffered on the great day of unleavened bread. And they state (διηγοῦνται) that Matthew says precisely what they have understood; hence their understanding of it is at variance with the law, and, according to them, the Gospels seem to contradict each other.'"[1] The last sentence is interpreted as pointing out that the first synoptic Gospel is supposed to be at variance with our fourth Gospel. This fragment is claimed by Tischendorf[2] and others as evidence of the general acceptance, at that time, both of the Synoptics and the fourth Gospel. Dr. Westcott, with obvious exaggeration, says: "The Gospels are evidently quoted as books certainly known and recognised; their authority is placed on the same footing as the Old Testament."[3] The Gospels are referred to merely for the settlement of the historical fact as to the day on which the last Passover had been eaten, a narrative of which they contained.

There are, however, very grave reasons for doubting the authenticity of the two fragments ascribed to Apollinaris, and we must mention that these doubts are much less those of German critics, who either do not raise the question at all or hastily dispose of it, than doubts entertained by orthodox apologists, who see little ground for accepting them as genuine.[4] Eusebius, who gives a catalogue of the works of Apollinaris which had reached him,[5] was evidently not acquainted with any writing of his on the Passover. It is argued, however, that "there is not any sufficient ground for doubting the genuineness of these fragments *On Easter*, in the fact that Eusebius mentions no such book by Apollinaris."[6] It is quite true that Eusebius does not pretend to give a complete list of these works, but merely says that there are many preserved by many, and that he mentions those with which he had met.[7] At the same time, entering with great interest, as

[1] *Præfat. Chron. Pasch. sive Alex. ed.* Ducange, p. 6; Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.*, i., p. 160.

[2] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 18. [3] *On the Canon*, p. 199.

[4] Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 247 f.; Lardner, *Credibility, etc., Works*, 1788, ii., p. 296; Tillemont, *Mém. Hist. Eccles.*, ii., pt. iii., p. 91; cf. Neander, *K. G.* 1842, i., p. 513, anm. 1.

[5] *H. E.*, iv. 27.

[6] Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 198, note 3; cf. Baur, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 340 f. This is the only remark which Dr. Westcott makes as to any doubt of the authenticity of these fragments. Tischendorf does not mention a doubt at all.

[7] *H. E.*, iv. 27.

he does, into the Paschal controversy, and acquainted with the principal writings on the subject,[1] it would indeed have been strange had he not met with the treatise itself, or at least with some notice of it in the works of others. Eusebius gives an account of the writings of Melito and Apollinaris together. He was acquainted with the work of Melito on the Passover, and quotes it,[2] and it is extremely improbable that he could have been ignorant of a treatise by his distinguished contemporary on the same subject had he actually written one. Not only, however, does Eusebius seem to know nothing of his having composed such a work, but neither do Theodoret,[3] Jerome,[4] nor Photius,[5] who refer to his writings, mention it; and we cannot suppose that it was referred to in the lost works of Irenæus or Clement of Alexandria on the Passover. Eusebius, who quotes from them,[6] would in that case have probably mentioned the fact, as he does the statement by Clement regarding Melito's work, or at least would have been aware of the existence of such a writing, and alluded to it when speaking of the works of Apollinaris.

This silence is equally significant whether we regard Apollinaris as a Quartodeciman or as a supporter of the views of Victor and the Church of Rome. On the one hand, Eusebius states that "all the churches of Asia"[7] kept the 14th Nisan, and it is difficult to believe that, had Apollinaris differed from this practice and, more especially, had he written against it, the name of so eminent an exception would not have been mentioned. The views of the Bishop of Hierapolis, as a prominent representative of the Asiatic Church, must have been quoted in many controversial works on the subject, and even if the writing itself had not come into their hands, Eusebius and others could scarcely fail to become indirectly acquainted with it. On the other hand, supposing Apollinaris to have been a Quartodeciman, whilst the ignorance of Eusebius and others regarding any contribution by him to the discussion is scarcely less remarkable, it is still more surprising that no allusion is made to him by Polycrates[8] when he names so many less distinguished men of Asia, then deceased, who kept the 14th Nisan, such as Thraseas of Eumenia, Sagoris of Laodicea, Papirius of Sardis, and the seven Bishops of his kindred, not to mention Polycarp of Smyrna and the Apostles Philip and John. He also cites Melito of Sardis: why does he not refer to Apollinaris of Hierapolis? If it be argued that he was still living, then why does Eusebius not mention him amongst those who protested against the measures of Victor of Rome?[9]

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 23, 24.
[2] *Ib.*, iv. 26.
[3] *Hæret. Fab.*, ii. 21, iii. 2.
[4] *Vir. Ill.* 26.
[5] *Biblioth. Cod.*, 14.
[6] *H. E.*, v. 24, iv. 26; cf. vi. 13.
[7] *Ib.*, v. 23.
[8] *Ib.*, v. 24.
[9] *Ib.*, v., 23, 24.

There has been much discussion as to the view taken by the writer of these fragments, Hilgenfeld and others[1] maintaining that he is opposed to the Quartodeciman party. Into this it is not necessary for us to enter, as our contention simply is that in no case can the authenticity of the fragments be established. Supposing them, however, to be directed against those who kept the 14th Nisan, how can it be credited that this isolated convert to the views of Victor and the Roman Church could write of so vast and distinguished a majority of the Churches of Asia, including Polycarp and Melito, as "some who through ignorance raised contentions" on the point, when they really raised no new contention at all, but, as Polycrates represented, followed the tradition handed down to them from their fathers, and authorised by the practice of the Apostle John himself!

None of his contemporaries nor writers about his own time seem to have known that Apollinaris wrote any work from which these fragments can have been taken, and there is absolutely no independent evidence that he ever took any part in the Paschal controversy at all. The only ground we have for attributing these fragments to him is the preface to the *Paschal Chronicle* of Alexandria, written by an unknown author of the seventh century some five hundred years after the time of Apollinaris, whose testimony has rightly been described as "worth almost nothing."[2] Most certainly many passages preserved by him are inauthentic, and generally allowed to be so.[3] The two fragments have by some been conjecturally ascribed to Pierius of Alexandria, a writer of the third century, who composed a work on Easter; but there is no evidence on the point. In any case, there is such exceedingly slight reason for attributing these fragments to Claudius Apollinaris, and so many strong grounds for believing that he cannot have written them, that they have no material value as evidence for the antiquity of the Gospels.

We know little or nothing of Athenagoras. He is not mentioned by Eusebius, and our only information regarding him is derived from a fragment of Philip Sidetes, a writer of the fifth century, first published by Dodwell.[4] Philip states that he was the first leader of the school of Alexandria during the time of Hadrian and Antoninus, to the latter of whom he addressed his

[1] Hilgenfeld, *Der Paschastreit*, 1860, p. 255 f.; Baur, *K.G.*, i., p. 157; Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii., p. 406 f.

[2] Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 247; Lardner, *Credibility*, etc., *Works*, ii., p. 296.

[3] Dr. Donaldson rightly calls a fragment in the *Chronicle* ascribed to Melito, "unquestionably spurious" (*Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 231).

[4] *Append. ad Diss. Iren.*, p. 488. The extract from *Philip's History* is made by an unknown author.

Apology; and he further says that Clement of Alexandria was his disciple, and that Pantænus was the disciple of Clement. Part of this statement we know to be erroneous, and the *Christian History* of Philip, from which the fragment is taken, is very slightingly spoken of both by Socrates[1] and Photius.[2] No reliance can be placed upon this information.

The only works ascribed to Athenagoras are an Apology—called an Embassy, *πρεσβεία*—bearing the inscription: "The Embassy of Athenagoras the Athenian, a philosopher and a Christian, concerning Christians, to the Emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus, Armeniaci Sarmatici and, above all, philosophers"; and further, a Treatise: *On the Resurrection of the Dead.* A quotation from the Apology by Methodius in his work on the Resurrection of the Body is preserved by Epiphanius[3] and Photius,[4] and this, the mention by Philip Sidetes, and the inscription by an unknown hand just quoted, are all the evidence we possess regarding the Apology. We have no evidence at all regarding the treatise on the Resurrection, beyond the inscription. The authenticity of neither therefore stands on very sure grounds. The address of the Apology and internal evidence furnished by it, into which we need not go, show that it could not have been written before A.D. 176–177, the date assigned to it by most critics, although there are many reasons for dating it some years later.

In the six lines which Tischendorf devotes to Athenagoras, he says that the Apology contains "several quotations from Matthew and Luke,"[5] without, however, indicating them. In the very few sentences which Dr. Westcott vouchsafes to him, he says: "Athenagoras quotes the words of our Lord as they stand in St. Matthew four times, and appears to allude to passages in St. Mark and St. John, but he nowhere mentions the name of an Evangelist."[6] Here the third Synoptic is not mentioned. In another place he says: "Athenagoras at Athens and Theophilus at Antioch make use of the same books generally, and treat them with the same respect"; and in a note: "Athenagoras quotes the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John."[7] Here it will be observed that also the Gospel of Mark is quietly dropped out of sight, but still the positive manner in which it is asserted that Athenagoras quotes from "the Gospel of St. Matthew," without further explanation, is calculated to mislead. We shall refer to each of the supposed quotations.

Athenagoras not only does not mention any Gospel, but singularly enough he never once introduces the name of "Christ"

[1] *H. E.*, vii. 27. [2] *Bibl. Cod.*, xxxv., p. 21. [3] *Hær.*, lxiv. 21.
[4] *Bibl. Cod.*, ccxxxiv., p. 908. [5] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 19.
[6] *On the Canon*, p. 103. [7] *Ib.*, p. 304, and note 2.

into the works ascribed to him, and all the "words of the Lord" referred to are introduced simply by the indefinite "he says," *φησί*, and without any indication whatever of a written source. The only exception to this is an occasion on which he puts into the mouth of "the Logos" a saying which is not found in any of our Gospels. The first passage to which Dr. Westcott alludes is the following, which we contrast with the supposed parallel in the Gospel :—

Athenagoras.	Matt. v. 39–40.
For we have learnt not only not to render a blow, nor to go to law (*δικάζεσθαι*) with those who spoil and plunder us, but even to those who should strike (us) on one side of the forehead (*κατὰ κόρρης προσπηλακίζωσι*) to offer for a blow the other side of the head also; and to those who should take away (*ἀφαιροῦντο*) the coat, to give also (*ἐπιδιδόναι*) the cloak besides.[1]	But I say unto you: that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek (*σε ῥαπίσει ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν σου σιαγόνα*) turn to him the other also. And if any man be minded to sue thee at the law (*κριθῆναι*) and take away (*λαβεῖν*) thy coat, let him have (*ἄφες αὐτῷ*) thy cloak also.[2]

It is scarcely possible to imagine a greater difference in language conveying a similar idea than that which exists between Athenagoras and the first Gospel, and the parallel passage in Luke is in many respects still more distant. No echo of the words in Matthew has lingered in the ear of the writer, for he employs utterly different phraseology throughout, and nothing can be more certain than the fact that there is not a linguistic trace in it of acquaintance with our Synoptics.

The next passage which is referred to is as follows : –

Athenagoras.	Matt. v. 44–45.
What, then, are those precepts in which we are instructed? I say unto you: love your enemies, bless them that curse, pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father which is in the heavens who (*ὅς*) maketh his sun, etc.[3]	But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you,[4] do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that[5] persecute you: That ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven: for (*ὅτι*) he maketh his sun, etc.[6]

[1] *Legation pro Christianis*, § 1.

[2] Matt. v. 39, 40; cf. Luke vi. 29.

[3] Λέγω ὑμῖν· Ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους, προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς, ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὃς τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει, κ.τ.λ. *Leg. Pro. Christ.*, § 11.

[4] The expressions, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς, "bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you," are omitted from some of the oldest MSS., but we do not know any in which the first of these two doubtful phrases is retained, as in Athenagoras, and the "do good to them that hate you" is omitted.

[5] The phrase, ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς, "despitefully use you," is omitted from many ancient codices.

[6] Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν

The same idea is continued in the next chapter, in which the following passage occurs :—

ATHENAGORAS.	MATT. v. 46.
For if ye love (ἀγαπᾶτε), he says, (φησί) them which love, and lend to them which lend to you, what reward shall ye have?[1]	For if ye should love (ἀγαπήσητε) them which love you, what reward have ye?[2]

There is no parallel at all in the first Gospel to the phrase, "and lend to them that lend to you," and in Luke vi. 34 the passage reads: "and if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye?" (*καὶ ἐὰν δανίζετε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν*;). It is evident, therefore, that there are decided variations here, and that the passage of Athenagoras does not agree with either of the Synoptics. We have seen the persistent variation in the quotations from the "Sermon on the Mount" which occur in Justin,[3] and there is no part of the discourses of Jesus more certain to have been preserved by living Christian tradition, or to have been recorded in every form of Gospel. The differences in these passages from our Synoptic present the same features as mark the several versions of the same discourse in our first and third Gospels, and indicate a distinct source. The same remarks also apply to the next passage :—

ATHENAGORAS.	MATT. v. 28.
For whosoever, he says (φησί), looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery (μεμοίχευκεν) already in his heart.[4]	But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her (ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν) already in his heart.[5]

The omission of *αὐτήν*, "with her," is not accidental, but is an important variation in the sense, which we have already met with in the Gospel used by Justin Martyr.[6] There is another passage, in the next chapter, the parallel to which follows closely on this in the great Sermon as reported in our first Gospel, to which Dr. Westcott does not refer, but which we must point out :—

διωκόντων ὑμᾶς· ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει, κ.τ.λ. Matt. v. 44, 45.

[1] *Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπᾶτε, φησίν, τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας, καὶ δανείζετε τοῖς δανείζουσιν ὑμῖν, τίνα μισθὸν ἕξετε. Leg. pro Chr.*, § 12.

[2] *Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε.* Matt. v. 46.

[3] Justin likewise has *ἀγαπᾶτε* for *ἀγαπήσητε* in this passage.

[4] *Ὁ γὰρ βλέπων, φησί, γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς, ἤδη μεμοίχευκεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ. Leg. pro Chr.*, § 32.

[5] *Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.*

[6] *Apol.*, i. 15.

Athenagoras.	Matt. v. 32.
For whosoever, he says (*φησί*), shall put away his wife and marry another committeth adultery.[1]	But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her when divorced committeth adultery.[2]

It is evident that the passage in the Apology is quite different from that in the "Sermon on the Mount" in the first Synoptic. If we compare it with Matt. xix. 9, there still remains the express limitation *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*, which Athenagoras does not admit, his own express doctrine being in accordance with the positive declaration in his text. In the immediate context, indeed, he insists that even to marry another wife after the death of the first is cloaked adultery. We find in Luke xvi. 18 the reading of Athenagoras,[3] but with important linguistic variation :—

Athenagoras.	Luke. xvi. 18.
Ος γὰρ ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται.	*Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχεύει.*

It cannot, obviously, be rightly affirmed that Athenagoras must have derived this from Luke, and the sense of the passage in that Gospel, compared with the passage in Matt. xix. 9, on the contrary, rather makes it certain that the reading of Athenagoras was derived from a source combining the language of the one and the thought of the other. In Mark x. 11 the reading is nearer that of Athenagoras, and confirms this conclusion : and the addition there of *ἐπ' αὐτήν*, "against her," after *μοιχᾶται*, further tends to prove that his source was not that Gospel.

We may at once give the last passage which is supposed to be a quotation from our Synoptics, and it is that which is affirmed to be a reference to Mark. Athenagoras states in almost immediate context with the above : "for in the beginning God formed one man and one woman."[4] This is compared with Mark x. 6 : "But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female":—

Athenagoras.	Mark. x. 6.
Οτι ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ Θεὸς ἕνα ἄνδρα ἔπλασε καὶ μίαν γυναῖκα.	*Ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς ὁ Θεός.*

[1] "Ος γὰρ ἂν ἀπολύσῃ, φησὶ, τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχᾶται. *Leg. pro Chr.*, § 33.

[2] Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι, καὶ ὃς ἂν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾶται· Matt. v. 32. *πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων* is the older and better reading, but we give *ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ* as favouring the similarity.

[3] Lardner, indeed, points to the passage as a quotation from the third Gospel. *Works*, ii., p. 183.

[4] *Leg. pro Chr.*, § 33.

This passage differs materially in every way from the second Synoptic. The reference to "one man" and "one woman" is used in a totally different sense, and enforces the previous assertion that a man may only marry one wife. Such an argument, directly derived from the Old Testament, is perfectly natural to one who, like Athenagoras, derived his authority from it alone. It is not permissible to claim it as evidence of the use of Mark.

We must repeat that Athenagoras does not name any source from which he derives his knowledge of the sayings of Jesus. These sayings are all from the Sermon on the Mount, and are introduced by the indefinite phrase *φησί*; and it is remarkable that all differ distinctly from the parallels in our Gospels. The whole must be taken together as coming from one source, and while the decided variation excludes the inference that they must have been taken from our Gospels, there is reasonable ground for assigning them to a different source. Dr. Donaldson states the case with great fairness: "Athenagoras makes no allusion to the inspiration of any of the New Testament writers. He does not mention one of them by name, and one cannot be sure that he quotes from any except Paul. All the passages taken from the Gospels are parts of our Lord's discourses, and may have come down to Athenagoras by tradition."[1] He should have added that they might also have been derived from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or many other collections now unhappily lost.

One circumstance strongly confirming this conclusion is the fact already mentioned, that Athenagoras, in the same chapter in which one of these quotations occurs, introduces an apocryphal saying of the Logos, and connects it with previous sayings by the expression, "The Logos *again* (*πάλιν*) saying to us." This can only refer to the sayings previously introduced by the indefinite *φησί*. The sentence, which is in reference to the Christian salutation of peace, is as follows: "The Logos again saying to us: 'If any one for this reason kiss a second time because it pleased him (he sins)'; and adding: 'Thus the kiss, or rather the salutation, must be used with caution, as, if it be defiled even a little by thought, it excludes us from the life eternal.'"[2] This saying, which is directly attributed to the Logos, is not found in our Gospels. The only natural deduction is that it comes from the same source as the other sayings, and that source was not our synoptic Gospels.

The total absence of any allusion to New Testament Scriptures

[1] *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 172. De Wette says regarding Athenagoras: "The quotations of evangelical passages prove nothing" (*Einl. A. T.*, 1852, p. 25).

[2] *Leg. pro Chr.*, § 32.

in Athenagoras, however, is rendered more striking and significant by the marked expression of his belief in the inspiration of the Old Testament. He appeals to the prophets for testimony as to the truth of the opinions of Christians—men, he says, who spoke by the inspiration of God, whose Spirit moved their mouths to express God's will as musical instruments are played upon:[1] "But since the voices of the prophets support our arguments, I think that you, being most learned and wise, cannot be ignorant of the writings of Moses, or of those of Isaiah and Jeremiah and of the other prophets, who, being raised in ecstasy above the reasoning that was in themselves, uttered the things which were wrought in them, when the Divine Spirit moved them, the Spirit using them as a flute-player would blow into the flute."[2] He thus enunciates the theory of the mechanical inspiration of the writers of the Old Testament in the clearest manner, and it would, indeed, have been strange, on the supposition that he extended his views of inspiration to any of the Scriptures of the New Testament, that he never names a single one of them, nor indicates to the Emperors in the same way, as worthy of their attention, any of these Scriptures along with the Law and the Prophets. There can be no doubt that he nowhere gives reason for supposing that he regarded any other writings than the Old Testament as inspired or "Holy Scripture."[3]

In the seventeenth year of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, between the 7th March, 177 178, a fierce persecution was, it is said,[4] commenced against the Christians in Gaul, and more especially at Vienne and Lyons, during the course of which the aged Bishop Pothinus, the predecessor of Irenæus, suffered martyrdom for the faith. The two communities some time after addressed an Epistle to their brethren in Asia and Phrygia, and also to Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome,[5] relating the events which had occurred, and the noble testimony which had been borne to Christ by the numerous martyrs who had been cruelly put to death. The Epistle has in great part been preserved by Eusebius,[6] and critics generally agree in dating it about A.D. 177, although it was most probably not written until the following year.[7]

No writing of the New Testament is mentioned in this Epistle, but it is asserted that there are "unequivocal coincidences of language"[8] with the Gospel of Luke, and others of its books.

[1] *Leg. pro Chr.*, § 7. [2] *Ib.*, § 9.

[3] In the treatise on the Resurrection there are no arguments derived from Scripture.

[4] Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. *Proem.* [5] *Ib.*, v. 3. [6] *Ib.*, v. 1 f.

[7] Baronius dates the death of Pothinus in A.D. 179; Valesius, *ad Euseb.*, *H. E.*, v. 5. [8] Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 295.

The passage which is referred to as showing knowledge of our Synoptic is as follows. The letter speaks of one of the sufferers, a certain Vettius Epagathus, whose life was so austere that, although a young man, "he was thought worthy of the testimony (*μαρτυρίᾳ*) borne by the elder (*πρεσβυτέρου*) Zacharias. He had walked, of a truth, in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless, and was untiring in every kind office towards his neighbour; having much zeal for God and being fervent in spirit."[1] This is compared with the description of Zacharias and Elizabeth in Luke i. 6: "And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless."[2] A little further on in the Epistle it is said of the same person: "Having in himself the advocate (*παράκλητον*), the spirit (*τὸ πνεῦμα*), more abundantly than Zacharias," etc.,[3] which again is referred to Luke i. 67, "And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Spirit and prophesied, saying," &c.[4]

A few words must be said regarding the phrase, *τῇ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ζαχαρίου μαρτυρίᾳ*, "the testimony of the presbyter Zacharias." This, of course, may either be rendered: "the testimony borne to Zacharias," that is to say, borne by others to his holy life; or, "the testimony borne by Zacharias," his own testimony to the Faith: his martyrdom. We adopt the latter rendering for various reasons. The Epistle is an account of the persecution of the Christian community of Vienne and Lyons, and Vettius Epagathus is the first of the martyrs who is named in it: *μαρτυρία* was at that time the term used to express the supreme testimony of Christians—martyrdom, and the Epistle seems here simply to refer to the martyrdom, the honour of which he shared with Zacharias. It is, we think, very improbable that under such circumstances the word *μαρτυρία* would have been used to express a mere description of the character of Zacharias given by some other writer. The interpretation which we prefer is that adopted by Tischendorf.[5] We must add that the Zacharias here spoken of is generally understood to be the father of John the Baptist,

[1] .....*συνεξισοῦσθαι τῇ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ζαχαρίου μαρτυρίᾳ· πεπόρευτο γοῦν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασι τοῦ Κυρίου ἄμεμπτος, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ πρὸς τὸν πλησίον λειτουργίᾳ ἄοκνος, ζῆλον Θεοῦ πολὺν ἔχων, καὶ ζέων τῷ πνεύματι, κ.τ.λ.* Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 1.

[2] *ἦσαν δὲ δίκαιοι ἀμφότεροι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, πορευόμενοι ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασιν τοῦ κυρίου ἄμεμπτοι.* Luke i. 6.

[3] *ἔχων δὲ τὸν παράκλητον ἐν ἑαυτῷ, τὸ πνεῦμα πλεῖον τοῦ Ζαχαρίου.* Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 1.

[4] *Καὶ Ζαχαρίας ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἐπροφήτευσεν λέγων, κ.τ.λ.* Luke i. 67.

[5] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 80, n. 1. See also Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 155, and others.

and no critic, so far as we can remember, has suggested that the reference in Luke xi. 51 applies to him.[1] Since the Epistle, therefore, refers to the martyrdom of Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, when using the expressions which are supposed to be taken from our third Synoptic, is it not reasonable to suppose that those expressions were derived from some work which likewise contained an account of his death, which is not found in the Synoptic? When we examine the matter more closely, we find that, although none of the Canonical Gospels, except the third, gives any narrative of the birth of John the Baptist, that portion of the Gospel in which are the words we are discussing cannot be considered an original production by the third Synoptist, but, like the rest of his work, is merely a composition, based upon earlier written narratives. Ewald, for instance, assigns the whole of the first chapters of Luke (i. 5–ii. 40) to what he terms "the eighth recognisable book."[2]

However this may be, the fact that other works existed at an earlier period in which the history of Zacharias the father of the Baptist was given, and in which not only the words used in the Epistle were found but also the martyrdom, is in the highest degree probable; and, so far as the history is concerned, this is placed almost beyond doubt by the Protevangelium Jacobi which contains it. Tischendorf, who does not make use of this Epistle at all as evidence for the Scriptures of the New Testament, does refer to it, and to this very allusion in it to the martyrdom of Zacharias, as testimony to the existence and use of the Protevangelium Jacobi, a work whose origin he dates so far back as the first three decades of the second century,[3] and which he considers was also used by Justin, as Hilgenfeld had already observed.[4] Tischendorf and Hilgenfeld, therefore, agree in affirming that the reference to Zacharias which we have quoted indicates acquaintance with a different Gospel from our third Synoptic. Hilgenfeld rightly maintains that the Protevangelium Jacobi in its present shape is merely an altered form of an older work,[5] which he conjectures to have been the Gospel according to Peter, or the Gnostic work, Γέννα Μαρίας,[6] and both he and Tischendorf show that many of the Fathers[7] were either acquainted with

[1] The great majority of critics consider it a reference to 2 Chron. xxiv. 21, though some apply it to a later Zacharias.

[2] *Die drei erst. Evv.*, p. 97 f.

[3] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 76 ff., 80, anm. 1; cf. *Evang. Apocr. Proleg.*, p. xii. f.

[4] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 76 f., p. 80, anm. 1; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 154 f.

[5] *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 154 f. [6] *Ib.*, p. 160 f.

[7] Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 76 ff.; cf. *Evang. Apoc. Proleg.*, p. xii. f.; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. J.*, p. 154 f.

the Protevangelium itself or the works on which it was based.

The state of the case, then, is as follows : We find a coincidence in a few words in connection with Zacharias between the Epistle and our third Gospel ; but, so far from the Gospel being in any way indicated as their source, the words in question are connected with a reference to events unknown to our Gospel, but which were indubitably chronicled elsewhere. As part of the passage in the epistle, therefore, could not have been derived from our third Synoptic, the natural inference is that the whole emanates from a Gospel, different from ours, which likewise contained that part. In any case, the agreement of these few words, without the slightest mention of the third Synoptic in the epistle, cannot be admitted as proof that they must necessarily have been derived from it, and from no other source.

CHAPTER X.

PTOLEMÆUS AND HERACLEON—CELSUS—THE CANON OF MURATORI—RESULTS

We have now reached the extreme limit of time within which we think it in any degree worth while to seek for evidence as to the date and authorship of the Synoptics, and we might now proceed to the fourth Gospel; but before doing so it may be well to examine one or two other witnesses whose support has been claimed by apologists, although our attention may be chiefly confined to an inquiry into the date of such testimony, upon which its value, even if real, mainly depends so far as we are concerned. The first of these whom we must notice are the two Gnostic leaders, Ptolemæus and Heracleon.

Epiphanius has preserved a certain "Epistle to Flora" ascribed to Ptolemæus, in which, it is contended, there are "several quotations from Matthew, and one from the first chapter of John."[1] What date must be assigned to this Epistle? In reply to those who date it about the end of the second century, Tischendorf produces the evidence for an earlier period to which he assigns it. He says: "He (Ptolemæus) appears in all the oldest sources as one of the most important, most influential of the disciples of Valentinus. As the period at which the latter himself flourished falls about 140, do we say too much when we represent Ptolemæus as working at the latest about 160: Irenæus (in the 2nd Book) and Hippolytus name him together with Heracleon; likewise pseudo-Tertullian (in the appendix to *De Præscriptionibus Hæreticorum*) and Philastrius make him appear immediately after Valentinus. Irenæus wrote the first and second books of his great work most probably before 180, and in both he occupies himself much with Ptolemæus."[2] Dr. Westcott, beyond calling Ptolemæus and Heracleon disciples of Valentinus, does not assign any date to either, and does not, of course, offer any further evidence on the point, although, in regard to Heracleon, he admits the ignorance in which we are as to all points of his history,[3] and states generally, in treating of him, that "the exact chronology of the early heretics is very uncertain."[4]

[1] Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 46. Dr. Westcott, with greater caution, says: "He quoted words of our Lord recorded by St. Matthew, the prologue of St. John's Gospel, etc." (*On the Canon*, p. 267).

[2] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 46 f.

[3] *On the Canon*, p. 263.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 264, note 2.

Let us examine the evidence upon which Tischendorf relies for the date he assigns to Ptolemæus. He states in vague terms that Ptolemæus appears "in all the oldest sources" (*in allen den ältesten Quellen*) as one of the most important disciples of Valentinus. We shall presently see what these sources are, but must now follow the argument: "As the date of Valentinus falls about 140, do we say too much when we represent Ptolemæus as working at the latest about 160?" It is obvious that there is no evidence here, but merely assumption, and the manner in which the period "about 160" is begged is a clear admission that there are no certain data. The year might with equal propriety upon those grounds have been put ten years earlier or ten years later. The deceptive and arbitrary character of the conclusion, however, will be more apparent when we examine the grounds upon which the relative dates 140 and 160 rest. Tischendorf here states that the time at which Valentinus flourished falls about A.D. 140, but the fact is that, as all critics are agreed, and as even Tischendorf himself elsewhere states,[1] Valentinus came out of Egypt to Rome in that year, when his public career practically commenced, and he continued to flourish for at least twenty years after.[2] Tischendorf's pretended moderation, therefore, consists in dating the period when Valentinus flourished from the very year of his first appearance, and in assigning the active career of Ptolemæus to 160, when Valentinus was still alive and teaching. He might on the same principle be dated 180, and even in that case there could be no reason for ascribing the Epistle to Flora to so early a period of his career. Tischendorf never even pretends to state any ground upon which Ptolemæus must be connected with any precise part of the public life of Valentinus, and still less for determining the period of the career of Ptolemæus at which the Epistle may have been composed. It is obvious that a wide limit for date thus exists.

After these general statements Tischendorf details the only evidence which is available. (1) "Irenæus (in the 2nd Book) and Hippolytus name him together with Heracleon; likewise (2) pseudo-Tertullian (in the appendix to *De Præscriptionibus Hæreticorum*) and Philastrius make him appear immediately after Valentinus," etc. We must examine these two points a little more closely in order to ascertain the value of such statements. With regard to the first (1), we shall presently see that the mention of the name of Ptolemæus along with that of Heracleon throws no light upon the matter from any point of view,

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 43. "*Valentinus, der um* 140 *aus Ägypten nach Rom kam und darauf noch* 20 *Jahre gelebt haben mag.*"

[2] Cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 4, § 3; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 11.

inasmuch as Tischendorf has as little authority for the date he assigns to the latter, and is in as complete ignorance concerning him as in the case of Ptolemæus. It is amusing, moreover, that Tischendorf employs the very same argument, which sounds well although it means nothing, inversely to establish the date of Heracleon. Here, he argues, "Irenæus and Hippolytus name him (Ptolemæus) together with Heracleon";[1] there, he reasons, "Irenæus names Heracleon together with Ptolemæus,"[2] etc. As neither the date assigned to the one nor to the other can stand alone, he tries to get them into something like an upright position by propping the one against the other—an expedient which, naturally, meets with little success. We shall in dealing with the case of Heracleon show how untenable is the argument from the mere order in which such names are mentioned by these writers; meantime we may simply say that Irenæus only once mentions the name of Heracleon in his works, and that the occasion on which he does so, and to which reference is here made, is merely an allusion to the Æons "of Ptolemæus himself, and of Heracleon, and all the rest who hold these views."[3] This phrase might have been used, exactly as it stands, with perfect propriety even if Ptolemæus and Heracleon had been separated by a century. The only point which can be deduced from this coupling of names is that, in using the present tense, Irenæus is speaking of his own contemporaries. We may make the same remark regarding Hippolytus, for, if his mention of Ptolemæus and Heracleon has any weight at all, it is to prove that they were flourishing in his time: "Those who are of Italy, of whom *is* Heracleon and Ptolemæus, say.....,"[4] etc. We shall have to go further into this point presently. As to (2) pseudo-Tertullian and Philastrius, we need only say that even if the fact of the names of the two Gnostics being coupled together could prove anything in regard to the date, the repetition by these writers could have no importance for us, their works being altogether based on those of Irenæus and Hippolytus,[5] and scarcely, if at all, conveying independent information.[6] We have merely indicated the weakness of these arguments in passing, but shall again take them up further on.

The next and final consideration advanced by Tischendorf is

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 47. [2] *Ib.*, p. 48.

[3] *Ipsius Ptolemæi et Heracleonis, et reliquorum omnium qui eadem opinantur* (*Adv. Hær.*, ii. 4, § 1).

[4] *Ref. Hom. Hær.*, vi. 35.

[5] Cf. Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanius*, 1865.

[6] Indeed, the direct and avowed dependence of Hippolytus himself upon the work of Irenæus deprives the Philosophumena, in many parts, of all separate authority.

the only one which merits serious attention. "Irenæus wrote the first and second book of his great work most probably before 180, and in both he occupies himself much with Ptolemæus." Before proceeding to examine the accuracy of this statement regarding the time at which Irenæus wrote, we may ask what conclusion would be involved if Irenæus really did compose the two books in A.D. 180 in which he mentions our Gnostics in the present tense? Nothing more than the simple fact that Ptolemæus and Heracleon were promulgating their doctrines at that time. There is not a single word to show that they did not continue to flourish long after; and as to the "Epistle to Flora," Irenæus apparently knows nothing of it, nor has any attempt been made to assign it to an early part of the Gnostic's career. Tischendorf, in fact, does not produce a single passage nor the slightest argument to show that Irenæus treats our two Gnostics as men of the past, or otherwise than as heretics then actively disseminating their heterodox opinions; and, even taken literally, the argument of Tischendorf would simply go to prove that about A.D. 180 Irenæus wrote part of a work in which he attacks Ptolemæus and mentions Heracleon.

When did Irenæus, however, really write his work against Heresies? Although our sources of credible information regarding him are exceedingly limited, we are not without materials for forming a judgment on the point. Irenæus was probably born about A.D. 140–145, and is generally supposed to have died at the beginning of the third century (A.D. 202). We know that he was deputed by the Church of Lyons to bear to Eleutherus, then Bishop of Rome, the Epistle of that Christian community describing their sufferings during the persecution commenced against them in the seventeenth year of the reign of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (7th March, 177–178).[1] It is very improbable that this journey was undertaken, in any case, before the spring of A.D. 178, and, indeed, in accordance with the given data, the persecution itself may not have commenced earlier than the beginning of that year, so that his journey need not have been undertaken before the close of 178 or the spring of 179, to which epoch other circumstances might lead us.[2] There is reason to believe that he remained some time in Rome. Baronius states that Irenæus was not appointed Bishop of Lyons till A.D. 180, for he says that the see remained vacant for that period after the death of Pothinus in consequence of the persecution. Now, certain expressions in his work show that Irenæus did not write it until he became Bishop.[3] It is not known how long Irenæus

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 1, *Præf.*; § 1, 3, 4.

[2] Baronius (*Ann. Eccles.*) sets the death of Pothinus in A.D. 179.

[3] Cf. *Adv. Hær.*, v. *Præf.*; Massuet, *Dissert. in Iren.*, ii., art. ii., § 49; Lardner, *Works*, ii., p. 157.

remained in Rome, but there is every probability that he must have made a somewhat protracted stay for the purpose of making himself acquainted with the various tenets of Gnostic and other heretics then being actively taught, and the preface to the first book refers to the pains he took. He wrote his work in Gaul, however, after his return from this visit to Rome. This is apparent from what he himself states in the Preface to the first Book: "I have thought it necessary," he says, "after having read the Memoirs (ὑπομνήμασι) of the disciples of Valentinus, as they call themselves, and *having had personal intercourse with some of them* and acquired full knowledge of their opinions, to unfold to thee,"[1] etc. A little further on he claims from the friend to whom he addresses his work indulgence for any defects of style on the score of his being resident amongst the Keltæ.[2] Irenæus no doubt, during his stay in Rome, came in contact with the school of Ptolemæus and Heracleon, if not with the Gnostic leaders themselves and, being shocked, as he describes himself, at the doctrines which they insidiously taught, he undertook, on his return to Lyons, to explain them that others might be exhorted to avoid such an "abyss of madness and blasphemy against Christ."[3] Irenæus gives us other materials for assigning a date to his work. In the third Book he enumerates the bishops who had filled the Episcopal Chair of Rome, and the last whom he names is Eleutherus (A.D. 177–190), who, he says, "now in the twelfth place from the apostles, holds the inheritance of the episcopate."[4] There is, however, another clue which, taken along with this, leads us to a close approximation to the actual date. In the same Book, Irenæus mentions Theodotion's version of the Old Testament: "But not as some of those say," he writes, "who now (νῦν) presume to alter the interpretation of the Scripture: 'Behold the young woman shall conceive, and bring forth a son,' as Theodotion, the Ephesian, translated it, and Aquila of Pontus, both Jewish proselytes."[5] Now we are informed by Epiphanius that Theodotion published his translation during the reign of the Emperor Commodus[6] (A.D. 180–192). The *Chronicon Paschale* adds that it was during the Consulship of Marcellus, or, as Massuet[7] proposes to read, Marullus, who, jointly with Ælianus, assumed office A.D. 184. These dates decidedly agree with the passage of Irenæus and with the other data, all of which lead us to about the same period within the episcopate of Eleutherus

[1] *Adv. Hær.*, i. *Præf.*, § 2 (see the passage quoted, p. 332 f.).
[2] *Ib.*, § 3. [3] *Ib.*, § 2.
[4] *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 3; Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 6.
[5] *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 21, § 1; Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 8.
[6] *De Ponderib. et Mens.*, 17.
[7] *Dissert. in Iren.*, ii., art. ii. xcvii., § 47.

(† c. 190).[1] We have here, therefore, a clue to the date at which Irenæus wrote. It must be remembered that at that period the multiplication and dissemination of books was a very slow process. A work published about 184 or 185 could scarcely have come into the possession of Irenæus in Gaul till some years later, and we are, therefore, brought towards the end of the episcopate of Eleutherus as the earliest date at which the first three books of his work against Heresies can well have been written, and the rest must be assigned to a later period under the episcopate of Victor († 198–199).[2]

At this point we must pause and turn to the evidence which Tischendorf offers regarding the date to be assigned to Heracleon.[3] As in the case of Ptolemæus, we shall give it entire, and then examine it in detail. To the all-important question, "How old is Heracleon?" Tischendorf replies: "Irenæus names Heracleon, together with Ptolemæus (II. 4, § 1), in a way which makes them appear as well-known representatives of the Valentinian school. This interpretation of his words is all the more authorised because he never again mentions Heracleon. Clement, in the 4th Book of his *Stromata*, written shortly after the death of Commodus (193), recalls an explanation by Heracleon of Luke xii. 8, when he calls him the most noted man of the Valentinian school (ὁ τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς δοκιμώτατος is Clement's expression). Origen, at the beginning of his quotation from Heracleon, says that he was held to be a friend of Valentinus (τὸν Οὐαλεντίνου λεγόμενον εἶναι γνώριμον Ἡρακλέωνα). Hippolytus mentions him, for instance, in the following way (vi. 29): 'Valentinus, and Heracleon, and Ptolemæus, and the whole school of these, disciples of Pythagoras and Plato.....' Epiphanius says (*Hær.* 41): 'Cerdo (the same who, according

[1] Cf. Credner, *Beiträge*, ii., p. 253 f.; De Wette, *Einl. A. T.*, 1852, p. 61 f., p. 62, anm. d.; Lardner, "He also speaks of the translation of Theodotion, which is generally allowed to have been published in the reign of Commodus." *Works*, ii., p. 156 f.; Massuet, *Dissert. in Iren.*, ii., art. ii. xcvii., § 47.

[2] Massuet, *Dissert. in Iren.*, ii., art. ii. xcvii. (§ 47), xcix. (§ 50); Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 24; cf. De Wette, *Einl. A. T.*, p. 62, anm. d. ("Er schrieb zw., 177–192"); cf. Credner, *Beiträge*, ii., p. 255. The late Dr. Mansel places the work "between A.D. 182–188." The Gnostic Heresies, p. 240. This date is partly based upon the mention of Eleutherus (cf. p. 240, note 2), which, it must be remembered, however, occurs in the third book. Jerome says: "*Hoc ille scripsit ante annos circiter trecentos*" (*Epist. ad Theod.*, § 53, al. 29). If, instead of "*trecentos*," which is an evident slip of the pen, we read "*ducentos*," his testimony as to the date exactly agrees.

[3] Dr. Westcott adds no separate testimony. He admits that "The history of Heracleon, the great Valentinian commentator, is full of uncertainty. Nothing is known of his country or parentage" (*On the Canon*, p. 263). And in a note, "The exact chronology of the early heretics is very uncertain" (p. 264, note 2).

to Irenæus III. 4, § 3, was in Rome under Bishop Hyginus with Valentinus) follows these (Ophites, Kainities, Sethiani), and Heracleon.' After all this, Heracleon certainly cannot be placed later than 150 to 160. The expression which Origen uses regarding his relation to Valentinus must, according to linguistic usage, be understood of a personal relation."[1]

We have already pointed out that the fact that the names of Ptolemæus and Heracleon are thus coupled together affords no clue in itself to the date of either, and their being mentioned as leading representatives of the school of Valentinus does not in any way involve the inference that they were not contemporaries of Irenæus, living and working at the time he wrote. The way in which Irenæus mentions them in this the only passage throughout his whole work in which he names Heracleon, and to which Tischendorf pointedly refers, is as follows: "But if it was not produced, but was generated by itself, then that which is void is both like, and brother to, and of the same honour with, that Father who has before been mentioned by Valentinus; but it is really more ancient, having existed long before, and is more exalted than the rest of the Æons of Ptolemæus himself, and of Heracleon, and all the rest who hold these views."[2] We fail to recognise anything special here, of the kind inferred by Tischendorf, in the way in which mention is made of the two later Gnostics. If anything be clear, on the contrary, it is that distinction is drawn between Valentinus and Ptolemæus and Heracleon, and that Irenæus points out inconsistencies between the doctrines of the founder and those of his later followers. It is quite irrelevant to insist merely, as Tischendorf does, that Irenæus and subsequent writers represent Ptolemæus and Haracleon and other Gnostics of his time as of "the school" of Valentinus. The question simply is, whether in doing so they at all imply that these men were not contemporaries of Irenæus, or necessarily assign their period of independent activity to the lifetime of Valentinus, as Tischendorf appears to argue? Most certainly not, and Tischendorf does not attempt to offer any evidence that they do so. We may perceive how utterly worthless such a fact is for the purpose of fixing an early date by merely considering the quotation which Tischendorf himself makes from Hippolytus: "Valentinus, therefore, and Heracleon and Ptolemæus, and the whole school of these, disciples

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 48.

[2] *Si autem non prolatum est, sed a se generatum est; et simile est, et fraternum, et ejusdem honoris id quod est vacuum, ei Patri qui prædictus est a Valentino: antiquius autem et multo ante exsistens, et honorificentius reliquis Æonibus ipsius Ptolemæi et Heracleonis, et reliquorum omnium qui eadem opinantur* (*Adv. Hær.*, ii. 4, § 1).

of Pythagoras and Plato....."[1] If the statement that men are of a certain school involves the supposition of coincidence of time, the three Gnostic leaders must be considered contemporaries of Pythagoras or Plato, whose disciples they are said to be. Again, if the order in which names are mentioned, as Tischendorf contends by inference throughout his whole argument, is to involve strict similar sequence of date, the principle applied to the whole of the early writers would lead to the most ridiculous confusion. Tischendorf quotes Epiphanius: "Cerdo follows these (the Ophites, Kainites, Sethiani), and Heracleon." Why he does so it is difficult to understand, unless it be to give the appearance of multiplying testimonies, for two sentences further on he is obliged to admit: "Epiphanius has certainly made a mistake, as in such things not unfrequently happens to him, when he makes Cerdo, who, however, is to be placed about 140, follow Heracleon."[2] This kind of mistake is, indeed, common to all the writers quoted, and when it is remembered that such an error is committed where a distinct and deliberate affirmation of the point is concerned, it will easily be conceived how little dependence is to be placed on the mere mention of names in the course of argument. We find Irenæus saying that "neither Valentinus, nor Marcion, nor Saturninus, nor Basilides" possesses certain knowledge,[3] and elsewhere: "of such an one as Valentinus, or Ptolemæus, or Basilides."[4] To base an argument as to date on the order in which names appear in such writers is preposterous.

Tischendorf draws an inference from the statement that Heracleon was said to be a γνώριμος of Valentinus, that Origen declares him to have been his friend, holding personal intercourse with him. Origen, however, evidently knew nothing individually on the point, and speaks from mere heresay, guardedly using the expression "said to be" (λεγόμενον εἶναι γνώριμον). But according to the later and patristic use of the word, γνώριμος meant nothing more than a "disciple," and it cannot here be necessarily interpreted into a "contemporary." Under no circumstances could such a phrase, avowedly limited to hearsay, have any weight. The loose manner in which the Fathers repeat each other, even in serious matters, is too well known to every one acquainted with their writings to require any remark. Their inaccuracy keeps pace with their want of critical judgment. We

[1] *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vi. 29.

[2] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 49. We do not here enter into the discussion of the nature of this error (see Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 129 f.; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 91; Riggenbach, *Die Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Johan.*, 1866, p. 79).

[3] *Adv. Hær.*, ii. 28, § 6.

[4] *Ib.*, ii. 28, §. 9.

have seen one of the mistakes of Epiphanius, admitted by Tischendorf to be only too common with him, which illustrates how little such data are to be relied on. We may point out another of the same kind committed by him in common with Hippolytus, pseudo-Tertullian, and Philastrius. Mistaking a passage of Irenæus[1] regarding the sacred Tetrad (Kol Arbas) of the Valentinian Gnosis, Hippolytus supposes Irenæus to refer to another heretic leader. He at once treats the Tetrad as such a leader named "Kolarbasus," and after dealing (vi. 4) with the doctrines of Secundus, Ptolemæus, and Heracleon, he proposes, § 5, to show "what are the opinions held by Marcus and Kolarbasus."[2] At the end of the same book he declares that Irenæus, to whom he states that he is indebted for a knowledge of their inventions, has completely refuted the opinions of these heretics, and he proceeds to treat of Basilides, considering that it has been sufficiently demonstrated "whose disciples are Marcus and Kolarbasus, the successors of the school of Valentinus."[3] At an earlier part of the work, he had spoken in a more independent way in reference to certain persons who had promulgated great heresies: "Of these," he says, "one is Kolarbasus, who endeavours to explain religion by measures and numbers."[4] The same mistake is committed by pseudo-Tertullian[5] and Philastrius,[6] each of whom devotes a chapter to this supposed heretic. Epiphanius, as might have been expected, fell into the same error, and he proceeds elaborately to refute the heresy of the Kolarbasians, "which is Heresy XV." He states that Kolarbasus follows Marcus and Ptolemæus,[7] and after discussing the opinions of this mythical heretic he devotes the next chapter, "which is Heresy XVI.," to the Heracleonites, commencing it with the information that "A certain Heracleon follows after Kolarbasus."[8] This absurd mistake[9] shows how little these writers knew of the Gnostics of whom they wrote, and how the one ignorantly follows the other.

The order, moreover, in which they set the heretic leaders varies considerably. It will be sufficient for us merely to remark

[1] *Adv. Hær.*, i. 14.

[2] *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vi., § 5. There can be no doubt that a chapter on Kolarbasus is omitted from the MS. of Hippolytus which we possess. Cf. Bunsen, *Hippolytus u. s. Zeit*, 1852, p. 54 f.

[3] *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vi., § 55.

[4] Ὧν εἰς μέν Κολάρβασος, ὃς διὰ μέτρων καὶ ἀριθμῶν ἐκτίθεσθαι θεοσέβειαν ἐπιχειρεῖ. *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, iv., § 13.

[5] *Hær.*, 15.

[6] *Ib.*, 43.

[7] *Ib.*, xxxv., § 1, p. 258.

[8] *Hær.*, xxxvi., § 1, p. 262.

[9] Volkmar, *Die Colarbasus-gnosis in Niedner's Zeitschr. hist. Theol.*, 1855; *Der Ursprung*, p. 128 f.; Baur, *K. G. d. drei erst. Jahrh.*, p. 204; anm. 1; Lipsius, *Der Gnosticismus, in Ersch. u. Gruber's Real. Encykl.*; *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiph.*, p. 166 f., 168 f.; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 91.

here that while pseudo-Tertullian[1] and Philastrius[2] adopt the following order after the Valentinians: Ptolemæus, Secundus, Heracleon, Marcus, and Kolarbasus; Epiphanius[3] places them: Secundus, Ptolemæus, Marcosians, Kolarbasus, and Heracleon; and Hippolytus[4] again: Secundus, Ptolemæus, Heracleon, Marcus, and Kolarbasus. The vagueness of Irenæus had left some latitude here, and his followers were uncertain. The somewhat singular fact that Irenæus only once mentions Heracleon, whilst he so constantly refers to Ptolemæus, taken in connection with this order, in which Heracleon is always placed after Ptolemæus,[5] and by Epiphanius after Marcus, may be reasonably explained by the fact that, whilst Ptolemæus had already gained considerable notoriety when Irenæus wrote, Heracleon may only have begun to come into notice. Since Tischendorf lays so much stress upon pseudo-Tertullian and Philastrius making Ptolemæus appear immediately after Valentinus, this explanation is after his own principles.

We have already pointed out that there is not a single passage in Irenæus, or any other early writer, assigning Ptolemæus and Heracleon to a period anterior to the time when Irenæus undertook to refute their opinions. Indeed, Tischendorf has not attempted to show that they do, and he has merely, on the strength of the general expression that these Gnostics were of the school of Valentinus, boldly assigned to them an early date. Now, as we have stated, he himself admits that Valentinus only came from Egypt to Rome in A.D. 140, and continued teaching till 160,[6] and these dates are most clearly given by Irenæus himself.[7] Why, then, should Ptolemæus and Heracleon, to take an extreme case, not have known Valentinus in their youth, and yet have flourished chiefly during the last two decades of the second century? Irenæus himself may be cited as a parallel case, which Tischendorf at least cannot gainsay. He is never tired of telling us that Irenæus was the disciple of Polycarp,[8] whose martyrdom he sets about A.D. 165; and he considers that the intercourse of Irenæus with the aged Father must properly be put about A.D. 150,[9] yet he himself dates the death of Irenæus A.D. 202,[10] and nothing is more certain than that the period of his greatest activity and influence falls precisely in the last twenty years of the second century. Upon his own data, therefore, that Valentinus may have taught for

[1] *Hær.*, 13 f. [2] *Ib.*, 39 f. [3] *Ib.*, 32 f.
[4] *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vi., § 3, 4, 5.
[5] Tertullian also makes Heracleon follow Ptolemæus (*Adv. Val.*, 4).
[6] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 43.
[7] *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 4, § 3; Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 11.
[8] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p 25, p. 11.
[9] *Ib.*, p. 12. Compare, however, p. 175 f. [10] *Ib.*, p. 11 f.

twenty years after his first appearance in Rome A.D. 140—and there is no ground whatever for asserting that he did not teach for even a much longer period—Ptolemæus and Heracleon might well have personally sat at the feet of Valentinus in their youth, as Irenæus is said to have done about the very same period at the feet of Polycarp, and yet, like him, have flourished chiefly towards the end of the century.

Although there is not the slightest ground for asserting that Ptolemæus and Heracleon were not contemporaries with Irenæus, flourishing like him towards the end of the second century, there are, on the other hand, many circumstances which altogether establish the conclusion that they were. We have already shown, in treating of Valentinus,[1] that Irenæus principally directs his work against the followers of Valentinus living at the time he wrote, and notably of Ptolemæus and his school.[2] In the preface to the first book, having stated that he writes after personal intercourse with some of the disciples of Valentinus,[3] he more definitely declares his purpose: "We will, then, to the best of our ability, clearly and concisely set forth the opinions of those who are *now* (νῦν) teaching heresy, *I speak particularly of the disciples of Ptolemæus* (τῶν περὶ Πτολεμαῖον), whose system is an offshoot from the school of Valentinus."[4] Nothing could be more explicit. Irenæus in this passage distinctly represents Ptolemæus as teaching at the time he is writing, and this statement alone is decisive, more especially as there is not a single known fact which is either directly or indirectly opposed to it.

Tischendorf lays much stress on the evidence of Hippolytus in coupling together the names of Ptolemæus and Heracleon with that of Valentinus; similar testimony of the same writer, fully confirming the above statement of Irenæus, will, therefore, have the greater force. Hippolytus says that the Valentinians differed materially among themselves regarding certain points which led to divisions, one party being called the Oriental and the other the Italian. "They of the Italian party, of whom *is* Heracleon and Ptolemæus, *say*, etc.....They, however, who are of the Oriental party, of whom is Axionicus and Bardesanes, maintain," etc.[5] Now, Ptolemæus and Heracleon are here quite clearly represented as being contemporary with Axionicus and Bardesanes, and, without discussing whether Hippolytus does not, in continuation, describe them as all living at the time he wrote,[6] there can be no

[1] P. 332 f.
[2] Dr. Westcott admits this (*On the Canon*, p. 266 f.).
[3] See passage quoted, p. 332 f. [4] *Adv. Hær.*, i., *Præf.*, § 2.
[5] *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vi. 35.
[6] Tischendorf did not refer to these passages at all originally, and only does so in the second and subsequent editions of his book, in reply to Volkmar and

doubt that some of them were, and that this evidence confirms again the statement of Irenæus. Hippolytus, in a subsequent part of his work, states that a certain Prepon, a Marcionite, has introduced something new, and "now, in our own time (ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις νῦν), has written a work regarding the heresy in reply to Bardesanes."[1] The researches of Hilgenfeld have proved that Bardesanes lived at least over the reign of Heliogabalus (218–222), and the statement of Hippolytus is thus confirmed.[2] Axionicus again was still flourishing when Tertullian wrote his work against the Valentinians (201–226). Tertullian says: "Axionicus of Antioch alone to the present day (*ad hodiernum*) respects the memory of Valentinus, by keeping fully the rules of his system."[3] Although on the whole they may be considered to have flourished somewhat earlier, Ptolemæus and Heracleon are thus shown to have been for a time at least contemporaries of Axionicus and Bardesanes.[4]

Moreover, it is evident that the doctrines of Ptolemæus and Heracleon represent a much later form of Gnosticism than that of Valentinus. It is generally admitted that Ptolemæus reduced the system of Valentinus to consistency,[5] and the inconsistencies which existed between the views of the Master and these later followers, and which indicate a much more advanced stage of development, are constantly pointed out by Irenæus and the Fathers who wrote in refutation of heresy. Origen also represents Heracleon as amongst those who held opinions sanctioned by the Church,[6] and both he and Ptolemæus must indubitably be classed amongst the latest Gnostics. It is clear, therefore, that Ptolemæus and Heracleon were contemporaries of Irenæus at the time he composed his work against Heresies (185–195), both, and

others in the *Vorwort* (p. ix. f.), and in a note (p. 49, note 2). Volkmar argues from the opening of the next chapter (36), Ταῦτα οὖν ἐκεῖνοι ζητείτωσαν καθ' αὑτούς (Let those heretics, therefore, discuss these points amongst themselves), that they are represented as contemporaries of Hippolytus himself at the time he wrote (A.D. 225–235), *Der Ursprung*, p. 23, p. 130 f. It is not our purpose to pursue this discussion, but, whatever may be the conclusion as regards the extreme deduction of Volkmar, there can be no doubt that the passage proves at least the date which was assigned to them against Tischendorf.

[1] *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vii. 31.

[2] Hilgenfeld, *Bardesanes*, 1864, p. 11 ff.; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 131, p. 23; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 80 ff.; Riggenbach, *Die Zeugnisse f. d. Ev. Johannis*, 1866, p. 78 f.; Scholten, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 90.

[3] *Adv. Val.*, 4; Hilgenfeld, *Bardesanes*, p. 15; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 130 f.; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 81.

[4] Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 23 f., p. 130 f.; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 82; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 90.

[5] Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 276.

[6] *In Joh.*, *T.* xvi., p. 236 f.; Grabe, *Spicil Patr.*, ii., p. 105.

especially the latter, flourishing and writing towards the end of the second century.

We mentioned, in first speaking of these Gnostics, that Epiphanius has preserved an Epistle, attributed to Ptolemæus, which is addressed to Flora, one of his disciples.[1] This Epistle is neither mentioned by Irenæus nor by any other writer before Epiphanius. There is nothing in the Epistle itself to show that it was really written by Ptolemæus himself. Assuming it to be by him, however, the Epistle was in all probability written towards the end of the second century, and it does not, therefore, come within the scope of our inquiry. We may, however, briefly notice the supposed references to our Gospels which it contains. The writer of the Epistle, without any indication of a written source from which he derived them, quotes sayings of Jesus for which parallels are found in our first Gospel. These sayings are introduced by such expressions as "he said," "our Saviour declared," but never as quotations from any Scripture. Now, in affirming that they are taken from the Gospel according to Matthew, apologists exhibit their usual arbitrary haste, for we must clearly and decidedly state that there is not a single one of the passages which does not present decided variations from the parallel passages in our first Synoptic. We subjoin for comparison in parallel columns the passages from the Epistle and Gospel: –

Epistle (Hær. xxxiii., § 3).	Matt. xii. 25.
Οἰκία γὰρ ἡ πόλις μερισθεῖσα ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν ὅτι μὴ δύναται στῆναι, ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ἀπεφήνατο.....	.....πᾶσα πόλις ἢ οἰκία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς οὐ σταθήσεται.
	Matt. xix. 8 and 6.
§ 4. ἔφη αὐτοῖς ὅτι Μωϋσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψε τὸ ἀπολύειν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ· ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γὰρ οὐ γέγονεν οὕτως. Θεὸς γάρ, φησί, συνέζευξε ταύτην τὴν συζυγίαν, καὶ ὁ συνέζευξεν ὁ κύριος, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω, ἔφη.	Λέγει αὐτοῖς Ὅτι Μωϋσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν ἀπολῦσαι τὰς γυναῖκας ὑμῶν· ἀπ' ἀρχῆς δὲ οὐ γέγονεν οὕτως. 6.....ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω.
	Matt. xv. 4–8.
§ 4. Θ γὰρ θεὸς, φησὶν, εἶπε, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου, ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται. ὑμεῖς δὲ, φησὶν, εἰρήκατε, τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις λέγων, δῶρον τῷ θεῷ ὃ ἐὰν ὠφεληθῇς ἐξ ἐμοῦ,	Ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἐνετείλατο, λέγων· Τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ Ὁ κακολογῶν, κ.τ.λ.[2] 5. ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε· Ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ πητρί, Δῶρον, ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῇς. καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσει τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, ἢ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ·
καὶ ἠκυρώσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ, διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ὑμῶν. Τοῦτο δὲ Ἡσαΐας ἐξεφώνησεν εἰπών,	6. καὶ ἠκυρώσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν. 7. ὑποκριταί, καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἡσαΐας, λέγων,
Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, κ.τ.λ.....	8. Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, κ.τ.λ.

[1] Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxxiii. 3–7.

[2] This phrase, from Leviticus xx. 9, occurs further on in the next chapter.

Epistle (Hær. xxxii., § 3).	Matt. v. 38–39.
§ 5. τὸ γὰρ, Ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος..... § 6. ἐγὼ γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι ὅλως τῷ πονηρῷ ἀλλὰ ἐάν τίς σε ῥαπίσῃ στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην σιαγόνα.[1]	Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη· Ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος. 39. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν. μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ· ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ῥαπίσει ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν σου σιαγόνα, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην·

It must not be forgotten that Irenæus makes very explicit statements as to the recognition of other sources of evangelical truth than our Gospels by the Valentinians, regarding which we have fully written when discussing the founder of that sect.[2] We know that they professed to have direct traditions from the Apostles through Theodas, a disciple of the Apostle Paul;[3] and in the Epistle to Flora allusion is made to the succession of doctrine received by direct tradition from the Apostles.[4] Irenæus says that the Valentinians profess to derive their views from unwritten sources,[5] and he accuses them of rejecting the Gospels of the Church;[6] but, on the other hand, he states that they had many Gospels different from what he calls the Gospels of the Apostles.[7]

With regard to Heracleon, it is said that he wrote Commentaries on the third and fourth Gospels. The authority for this statement is very insufficient. The assertion with reference to the third Gospel is based solely upon a passage in the *Stromata* of the Alexandrian Clement. Clement quotes a passage found in Luke xii. 8, 11, 12, and says: "Expounding this passage, Heracleon, the most distinguished of the school of Valentinus, says as follows," etc.[8] This is immediately interpreted into a quotation from a Commentary on Luke.[9] We merely point out that from Clement's remark it by no means follows that Heracleon wrote a Commentary at all; and, further, there is no evidence that the passage commented upon was actually from our third Gospel.[10] The *Stromata* of Clement were not written until after A.D. 193, and in them we find the first and only reference to this supposed Commentary. We need not here refer to the Commentary on the fourth Gospel,

[1] In the next chapter, § 7, there is *ἕνα γὰρ μόνον εἶναι ἀγαθὸν θεὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ἀπεφήνατο*, κ.τ.λ. Cf. Matt. xix. 17.....*εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός.*

[2] See p. 342 ff.

[3] Clemens Al., *Strom.*, vii. 17.

[4] Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxxiii. 7.

[5] *Adv. Hær.*, i. 8, § 1.

[6] *Ib.*, iii. 2, § 1.

[7] *Ib.*, iii. 11, § 9.

[8] *Strom.*, iv. 9, § 73.

[9] *In Lucæ igitur Evangelium Commentaria edidit Heracleon*, etc. (Grabe. *Spicil Patr.*, ii., p. 83).

[10] The second reference by Clement to Heracleon is in the fragment § 25; but it is doubted by apologists (cf. Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 264). It would, however, tend to show that the supposed Commentary could not be upon our Luke, as it refers to an apostolic injunction regarding baptism not found in our Gospels.

which is merely inferred from references in Origen (*c.* A.D. 225) but of which we have neither earlier nor fuller information.[1] We must, however, before leaving this subject, mention that Origen informs us that Heracleon quotes from the Preaching of Peter (Κήρυγμα Πέτρου, *Prædicatio Petri*), a work which, as we have already several times mentioned, was cited by Clement of Alexandria as authentic and inspired Holy Scripture.[2]

The epoch at which Ptolemæus and Heracleon flourished would, in any case, render testimony regarding our Gospels of little value. The actual evidence which they furnish, however, is not of a character to prove even the existence of our Synoptics, and much less does it in any way bear upon their character or authenticity.

A similar question of date arises regarding Celsus, who wrote a work entitled Λόγος ἀληθής, True Doctrine, which is no longer extant, of which Origen composed an elaborate refutation. The Christian writer takes the arguments of Celsus in detail, presenting to us, therefore, its general features, and giving many extracts; and, as Celsus professes to base much of his accusation upon the writings in use amongst Christians, although he does not name a single one of them, it becomes desirable to ascertain what those works were, and the date at which Celsus wrote. As usual, we shall state the case by giving the reasons assigned for an early date.

Arguing against Volkmar and others, who maintain, from a passage at the close of his work, that Origen, writing about the second quarter of the third century, represents Celsus as his contemporary,[3] Tischendorf, referring to the passage, which we shall give in its place, proceeds to assign an earlier date upon the following grounds: "But, indeed, even in the first book, at the commencement of the whole work, Origen says: 'Therefore, I cannot compliment a Christian whose faith is in danger of being shaken by Celsus, who yet does not even (οὐδὲ) still (ἔτι) live the common life among men, but already and long since (ἤδη καὶ πάλαι) is dead.' .....In the same first book Origen says: 'We have heard that there were two men of the name of Celsus, Epicureans, the first under Nero;

[1] Neither of the works, whatever they were, could have been written before the end of the second century. Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 22 f., 130 f., 165; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 91 f.; Ebrard, *Evang. Gesch.*, p. 874, § 142; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss Theol.*, 1867, p. 81 f.

[2] Clem. Al., *Strom.*, vi. 5, § 39, 6, § 48, 7, § 58, 15, § 128. Dr. Westcott says regarding Ptolemæus: "Two statements, however, which he makes are at variance with the Gospels: that our Lord's ministry was completed in a year: and that He continued for eighteen months with His disciples after His resurrection" (*On the Canon*, p. 268).

[3] Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 80; Scholten, *Die ält Zeugnisse*, p. 99 f.

this one' (that is to say, ours) 'under Hadrian and later.' It is not impossible that Origen mistakes when he identified his Celsus with the Epicurean living 'under Hadrian and later'; but it is impossible to convert the same Celsus of whom Origen says this into a contemporary of Origen. Or would Origen himself, in the first book, really have set his Celsus 'under Hadrian (117–138) and later,' yet in the eighth have said: 'We will wait (about 225) to see whether he will still accomplish this design of making another work follow'? Now, until some better discovery regarding Celsus is attained, it will be well to hold to the old opinion that Celsus wrote his book about the middle of the second century, probably between 150–160," etc.[1]

It is scarcely necessary to point out that the only argument advanced by Tischendorf bears solely against the assertion that Celsus was a contemporary of Origen, "about 225," and leaves the actual date entirely unsettled. He not only admits that the statement of Origen regarding the identity of his opponent with the Epicurean of the reign of Hadrian "and later" may be erroneous, but he tacitly rejects it, and, having abandoned the conjecture of Origen as groundless and untenable, he substitutes a conjecture of his own, equally unsupported by reasons, that Celsus probably wrote between 150–160. Indeed, he does not attempt to justify this date, but arbitrarily decides to hold by it until a better can be demonstrated. He is forced to admit the ignorance of Origen on the point, and he does not conceal his own.

Now it is clear that the statement of Origen in the preface to his work, quoted above, that Celsus, against whom he writes, is long since dead,[2] is made in the belief that this Celsus was the Epicurean who lived under Hadrian,[3] which Tischendorf, although he avoids explanation of the reason, rightly recognises to be a mistake. Origen undoubtedly knew nothing of his adversary, and it obviously follows that, his impression that he is Celsus the Epicurean being erroneous, his statement that he was long since dead, which is based upon that impression, loses all its value. Origen certainly at one time conjectured his Celsus to be the Epicurean of the reign of Hadrian, for he not only says so directly in the passage quoted, but on the strength of his belief in the fact he accuses him of inconsistency. "But Celsus," he says, "must be convicted of contradicting himself; for he is discovered from other of his works to have been an Epicurean; but here, because he considered that he could attack the Word more effectively by not avowing the views of Epicurus, he pretends, etc.

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 74. [2] *Contra Cels., Præf.*, § 4.
[3] *Ib.*, i. 8.

.....Remark, therefore, the falseness of his mind," etc.[1] And from time to time he continues to refer to him as an Epicurean,[2] although it is evident that, in the writing before him, he constantly finds evidence that he is of a wholly different school. Beyond this belief, founded avowedly on mere hearsay, Origen absolutely knows nothing of the personality of Celsus or the time at which he wrote,[3] and he sometimes very naïvely expresses his uncertainty regarding him. Referring in one place to certain passages which seem to imply a belief in magic on the part of Celsus, Origen adds: "I do not know whether he is the same who has written several books against magic."[4] Elsewhere he says: ".....the Epicurean Celsus (if he be the same who composed two other books against Christians)," etc.[5]

Not only is it apparent that Origen knows nothing of the Celsus with whom he is dealing, but it is almost impossible to avoid the conviction that, during the time he was composing his work, his impressions concerning the date and identity of his opponent became considerably modified. In the earlier portion of the first book[6] he has heard that his Celsus is the Epicurean of the reign of Hadrian; but a little further on[7] he confesses his ignorance as to whether he is the same Celsus who wrote against magic, which Celsus the Epicurean actually did. In the fourth book,[8] he expresses uncertainty as to whether the Epicurean Celsus had composed the work against Christians which he is refuting, and at the close of his treatise he seems to treat him as a contemporary. He writes to his friend Ambrosius, at whose request the refutation of Celsus was undertaken: "Know, however, that Celsus has promised to write another treatise after this one.....If, therefore, he has not fulfilled his promise to write a second book, we may well be satisfied with the eight books in reply to his Discourse. If, however, he has commenced and finished this work also, seek it and send it in order that we may answer it also, and confute the false teaching in it," etc.[9] From this passage, and supported by

[1] Cf. *Contra Cels.*, i. 8.
[2] Cf. *ib.*, i. 10, 21; iii. 75, 80; iv. 36.
[3] Neander, *K. G.*, 1842, i., p. 274.
[4] *Contra Cels.*, i. 68.
[5] *Ib.*, iv. 36.
[6] i. 8.
[7] i. 68.
[8] iv. 36.
[9] Ἴσθι μέντοι ἐπαγγελλόμενον τὸν Κέλσον ἄλλο σύνταγμα μετὰ τοῦτο ποιήσειν.....Εἰ μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἔγραψεν ὑποσχόμενος τὸν δεύτερον λόγον, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι ἀρκεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς τοῖς ὀκτὼ πρὸς τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ὑπαγορευθεῖσι βιβλίοις. Εἰ δὲ κἀκεῖνον ἀρξάμενος συνετέλεσε, ζήτησον, καὶ πέμψον τὸ σύγγραμμα, ἵνα καὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνο.....ὑπαγορεύσαντες. καὶ τὴν ἐν ἐκείνῳ ψευδοδοξίαν ἀνατρέψωμεν· κ.τ.λ. *Contra. Cels.*, viii. 76. We quote above the rendering of the passage referred to, p. 422, upon which Tischendorf (*Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 73 f.) insists. We may mention that, in strictness, the original Greek reads: "promises" instead of "has promised":....."did not write" instead of "has

other considerations, Volkmar and others assert that Celsus was really a contemporary of Origen.[1] To this, as we have seen, Tischendorf merely replies by pointing out that Origen, in the preface, says that Celsus was already dead, and that he was identical with the Epicurean Celsus who flourished under Hadrian and later. The former of these statements, however, was made under the impression that the latter was correct, and, as it is generally agreed that Origen was mistaken in supposing that Celsus the Epicurean was the author of the Λόγος ἀληθής, and Tischendorf himself admits the fact, the two earlier statements, that Celsus flourished under Hadrian, and consequently that he had long been dead, fall together, whilst the subsequent doubts regarding his identity not only stand, but rise into assurance at the close of the work, in the final request to Ambrosius.[2] There can be no doubt that the first statements and the closing paragraphs are contradictory, and, whilst almost all critics pronounce against the accuracy of the former, the inferences from the latter retain full force, confirmed as they are by the intermediate doubts expressed by Origen himself.

Even those who, like Tischendorf, in an arbitrary manner assign an early date to Celsus, although they do not support their conjectures by any satisfactory reasons of their own, all tacitly set aside these of Origen.[3] It is generally admitted by these, with Lardner[4] and Michaelis,[5] that the Epicurean Celsus, to whom Origen was at one time disposed to refer the work against Christianity, was the writer of that name to whom Lucian, his friend and contemporary, addressed his Alexander or Pseudomantis, and who really wrote against magic,[6] as Origen mentions.[7]

not written"; and "commenced and finished" instead of "has commenced and finished." This, however, does not materially affect the argument of Volkmar.

[1] Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 80, cf. 165; Scholten, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 100; cf. Riggenbach, *Die Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Johann.*, p. 83; Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philos. des Alterth.*, 1867, i., p. 237.

[2] *Contra Cels.*, viii. 76.

[3] Kirchhofer says that Origen himself does not assign a date to the work of Celsus: "but as he (Celsus) speaks of the Marcionites, he must, in any case, be set in the second half of the second century" (*Quellensamml.*, p. 330, anm. 1). Lardner decides that Celsus wrote under Marcus Aurelius, and chooses to date him A.D. 176 (*Works*, viii., p. 6). Bindemann dates between 170 180 (*Zeitschr. f. d. Hist. Theol.*, 1842, II. 2, p. 60, 107 f.; cf. Anger, *Synops. Ev. Proleg.*, p. xl.; Michaelis, *Einl. N. B.*, 1788, i., p. 41; Riggenbach, *Die Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Johan.*, p. 83; Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1845, p. 629). Dr. Westcott dates Celsus "towards the close of the second century" (*On the Canon*, p. 356). Keim dates the work about A.D. 178 (*Celsus' Wahres Wort*, 1873, p. 261 f.); so also Pélagaud, *Et. sur Celse*, 1878, p. 207 f.

[4] *Works*, viii., p. 6. [5] *Einl. N. B.*, i., p. 41. [6] Ψευδόμαντις, § 21.

[7] *Contra Cels.*, i. 68; Neander, *K. G.*, i., p. 275; Baur, *K. G., drei erst. Jahrh.*, p. 383, anm. 1; cf. Keim, *Celsus' Wahres Wort*, 1873, p. 275 f.

But although on this account Lardner assigns to him the date of A.D. 176, the fact is that Lucian did not write his Pseudomantis, as Lardner is obliged to admit,[1] until the reign of the Emperor Commodus (180–193), and even upon the supposition that this Celsus wrote against Christianity, of which there is not the slightest evidence, there would be no ground for dating the work before A.D. 180. On the contrary, as Lucian does not in any way refer to such a writing by his friend, there would be strong reason for assigning the work, if it be supposed to be written by him, to a date subsequent to the Pseudomantis. It need not be remarked that the references of Celsus to the Marcionites,[2] and to the followers of Marcellina,[3] only so far bear upon the matter as to exclude an early date.[4]

It requires very slight examination of the numerous extracts from, and references to, the work which Origen seeks to refute, however, to convince any impartial mind that the doubts of Origen were well founded as to whether Celsus the Epicurean were really the author of the Λόγος ἀληθής. As many critics of all shades of opinion have long since determined, so far from being an Epicurean, the Celsus attacked by Origen, as the philosophical opinions which he everywhere expresses clearly show, was a Neo-Platonist. Indeed, although Origen seems to retain some impression that his antagonist must be an Epicurean, as he had heard, and frequently refers to him as such, he does not point out Epicurean sentiments in his writings, but, on the contrary, not only calls upon him no longer to conceal the school to which he belongs and avow himself an Epicurean,[5] but accuses him of expressing views inconsistent with that philosophy,[6] or of so concealing his Epicurean opinions that it might be said that he is an Epicurean only in name.[7] On the other hand, Origen is clearly surprised to find that he quotes so largely from the writings, and shows such marked leaning towards the teaching, of Plato, in which Celsus indeed finds the original and purer form of many Christian doctrines;[8] and Origen is constantly forced to discuss Plato in meeting the arguments of Celsus.

The author of the work which Origen refuted, therefore, instead of being an Epicurean, as Origen supposed merely from there having been an Epicurean of the same name, was undoubtedly a

[1] *Works*, viii., p. 6; cf. Bindemann, *Zeitschr. hist. Theol.*, 1842, II. 2, p. 107.

[2] *Contra Cels.*, v. 62, vi. 53, 74. [3] *Ib.*, v. 62.

[4] Irenæus says that Marcellina came to Rome under Anicetus (157–168), and made many followers (*Adv. Hær.*, i. 25, § 6; cf. Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxvii. 6).

[5] *Contra Cels.*, iii. 80, iv. 54. [6] *Ib.*, i. 8. [7] *Ib.*, iv. 54.

[8] *Ib.*, i. 32, iii. 63, iv. 54, 55, 83, vi. 1, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 47, vii. 28, 31, 42, 58 f., etc.

Neo-Platonist, as Mosheim long ago demonstrated, of the school of Ammonius, who founded the sect at the close of the second century.[1] The promise of Celsus to write a second book with practical rules for living in accordance with the philosophy he promulgates, to which Origen refers at the close of his work, confirms this conclusion, and indicates a new and recent system of philosophy.[2] An Epicurean would not have thought of such a work—it would have been both appropriate and necessary in connection with Neo-Platonism.

We are, therefore, constrained to assign the work of Celsus to at least the early part of the third century, and to the reign of Septimius Severus. In it, Celsus repeatedly accuses Christians of teaching their doctrines secretly and against the law, which seeks them out and punishes them with death,[3] and this indicates a period of persecution. Lardner, assuming the writer to be the Epicurean friend of Lucian, supposes from this clue that the persecution referred to must have been that under Marcus Aurelius († 180), and, practically rejecting the data of Origen himself, without advancing sufficient reasons of his own, dates Celsus A.D. 176.[4] As a Neo-Platonist, however, we are more accurately led to the period of persecution which, from embers never wholly extinct since the time of Marcus Aurelius, burst into fierce flame, more especially in the tenth year of the reign of Severus[5] (A.D. 202), and continued for many years to afflict Christians.

It is evident that the dates assigned by apologists are wholly arbitrary, and even if our argument for the later epoch were very much less conclusive than it is, the total absence of evidence for an earlier date would completely nullify any testimony derived from Celsus. It is sufficient for us to add that, whilst he refers to incidents of Gospel history and quotes some sayings which have parallels, with more or less of variation, in our Gospels, Celsus nowhere mentions the name of any Christian book, unless we except the Book of Enoch;[6] and he accuses Christians, not without reason, of interpolating the books of the Sibyl, whose authority, he states, some of them acknowledged.[7]

The last document which we need examine in connection with the synoptic Gospels is the list of New Testament and other writings held in consideration by the Church, which is generally called, after its discoverer and first editor, the *Canon of Muratori.*

[1] *Inst. Hist. Eccles., lib.* i., *sæc.* ii., p. 1, cap. 2, § 8; *De Rebus Christ.*, *sæc.* ii., § 19, § 27.
[2] Cf. Neander, *K. G.*, i., p. 278.
[3] Origen, *Contra Cels.*, i. 1, 3, 7, viii. 69.
[4] *Works*, viii., p. 6.
[5] Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 1, 2.
[6] *Contra Cels.*, v. 54, 55.
[7] *Ib.*, vii. 53, 56.

This interesting fragment, which was published in 1740 by Muratori in his collection of Italian antiquities,[1] at one time belonged to the monastery of Bobbio, founded by the Irish monk Columban, and was found by Muratori in the Ambrosian Library at Milan in a MS. containing extracts of little interest from writings of Eucherius, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and others. Muratori estimated the age of the MS. at about a thousand years, but so far as we are aware no thoroughly competent judge has since expressed any opinion upon the point. The fragment, which is defective both at the commencement and at the end, is written in an apologetic tone, and professes to give a list of the writings which are recognised by the Christian Church. It is a document which has no official character, but which merely conveys the private views and information of the anonymous writer, regarding whom nothing whatever is known. From any point of view, the composition is of a nature permitting the widest differences of opinion. It is by some affirmed to be a complete treatise on the books received by the Church, from which fragments have been lost; whilst others consider it a mere fragment in itself. It is written in Latin, which by some is represented as most corrupt, whilst others uphold it as most correct.[2] The text is further rendered almost unintelligible by every possible inaccuracy of orthography and grammar, which is ascribed diversely to the transcriber, to the translator, and to both. Indeed, such is the elastic condition of the text, resulting from errors and obscurity of every imaginable description, that, by means of ingenious conjectures, critics are able to find in it almost any sense they desire. Considerable difference of opinion exists as to the original language of the fragment, the greater number of critics maintaining that the composition is a translation from the Greek, whilst others assert it to have been originally written in Latin.[3] Its composition is variously attributed to the Church of Africa and to a member of the Church in Rome.

The fragment commences with the concluding portion of

[1] *Antiquit. Ital. Med. Ævi*, iii., p. 851 f.

[2] Volkmar considers it in reality the reverse of corrupt. After allowing for peculiarities of speech, and for the results of an Irish-English pronunciation by the monk who transcribed it, he finds the characteristic original Latin, the old *lingua volgata* which, in the Roman provinces, such as Africa, etc., was the written as well as the spoken language (*Anhang zu* Credner's *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 341 f.).

[3] If the fragment, as there is some reason to believe, was originally written in Latin, it furnishes evidence that it was not written till the third century. Dr. Westcott, who concludes from the order of the Gospels, etc., that it was not written in Africa, admits that "There is no evidence of the existence of Christian Latin literature out of Africa till about the close of the second century."

a sentence....."*quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit*"—"at which nevertheless he was present, and thus he placed it." The MS. then proceeds: "Third book of the Gospel according to Luke. Luke, that physician, after the ascension of Christ when Paul took him with him....., wrote it in his name as he deemed best (*ex opinione*)—nevertheless he had not himself seen the Lord in the flesh—and he too, as far as he could obtain information, also begins to speak from the nativity of John." The text, at the sense of which this is a closely approximate guess, though several other interpretations might be maintained, is as follows: *Tertio evangelii librum secundo Lucan Lucas iste medicus post ascensum Christi cum eo Paulus quasi ut juris studiosum secundum adsumsisset numeni suo ex opinione concribset dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne et idem prout asequi potuit ita et ad nativitate Johannis incipet dicere.*

The MS. goes on to speak in more intelligible language "of the fourth of the Gospels of John, one of the disciples" (*Quarti evangeliorum Johannis ex decipolis*), regarding the composition of which the writer relates a legend, which we shall quote when we come to deal with that Gospel. The fragment then proceeds to mention the Acts of the Apostles—which is ascribed to Luke—thirteen epistles of Paul in peculiar order, and it then refers to an Epistle to the Laodiceans and another to the Alexandrians, forged, in the name of Paul, after the heresy of Marcion, "and many others which cannot be received by the Catholic Church, as gall must not be mixed with vinegar." The Epistle to the Ephesians bore the name of Epistle to the Laodiceans in the list of Marcion, and this may be a reference to it.[1] The Epistle to the Alexandrians is generally identified with the Epistle to the Hebrews, although some critics think this doubtful, or deny the fact, and consider both Epistles referred to pseudographs attributed to the Apostle Paul. The Epistle of Jude and two (the second and third) Epistles of John are, with some tone of doubt, mentioned amongst the received books, and so is the Book of Wisdom. The Apocalypses of John and of Peter only are received, but some object to the latter being read in church.

The Epistle of James, both Epistles of Peter, the Epistle to the Hebrews (which is, however, probably that entitled here the Epistle to the Alexandrians), and the first Epistle of John are omitted altogether, with the exception of a quotation which is supposed to be from the last-named Epistle, to which we shall hereafter

[1] Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, v. 17. Hilgenfeld, *Der Kanon*, p. 42; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 129; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 190, note 1. Cf. Schnekenburger, *Beitr. Einl. N. T.*, 1832, p. 153 f. It will be remembered that reference is made in the Epistle to the Colossians to an Epistle to the Laodiceans which is lost (Col. iv. 16).

refer. Special reference is made to the Shepherd of Hermas, regarding which the writer expresses his opinion that it should be read privately but not publicly in church, as it can be classed neither amongst the books of the prophets nor of the apostles. The fragment concludes with the rejection of the writings of several heretics.

It is inferred that in the missing commencement of the fragment the first two Synoptics must have been mentioned. This, though of course most probable, cannot actually be ascertained, and so far as these Gospels are concerned, therefore, the "Canon of Muratori" only furnishes conjectural evidence. The statement regarding the third Synoptic merely proves the existence of that Gospel at the time the fragment was composed, and we shall presently endeavour to form some idea of that date. Beyond this, the information given does not at all tend to establish the unusual credibility claimed for the Gospels. It is declared by the fragment, as we have quoted, that the third Synoptic was written by Luke, who had not himself seen the Lord, but narrated the history as best he was able. It is worthy of remark, moreover, that even the Apostle Paul, who took Luke with him after the Ascension, had not been a follower of Jesus, nor had seen him in the flesh; and certainly he did not, by the showing of his own Epistles, associate much with the other Apostles, so that Luke could not have had much opportunity while with him of acquiring any intimate knowledge of the events of Gospel history. It is undeniable that the third Synoptic is not the narrative of an eye-witness, and the occurrences which it records did not take place in the presence or within the personal knowledge of the writer, but were derived from tradition, or from written sources. Such testimony, therefore, could not in any case be of much service to our third Synoptic; but when we consider the uncertainty of the date at which the fragment was composed, and the certainty that it could not have been written at an early period, it will become apparent that the value of its evidence is reduced to a minimum.

We have already mentioned that the writer of this fragment is totally unknown, nor does there exist any clue by which he can be identified. All the critics who have assigned an early date to the composition of the fragment have based their conclusion, almost solely, upon a statement made by the author regarding the *Shepherd* of Hermas. He says: "Hermas in truth composed the *Shepherd* very recently in our times in the city of Rome, the Bishop Pius his brother, sitting in the chair of the church of the city of Rome. And, therefore, it should indeed be read, but it cannot be published in the church to the people, neither being among the prophets, whose

number is complete, nor amongst the apostles in the latter days."[1]

Muratori, the discoverer of the MS., conjectured for various reasons, which need not be here detailed, that the fragment was written by Caius the Roman Presbyter, who flourished at the end of the second (*c.* A.D. 196) and beginning of the third century, and in this he was followed by a few others.[2] The great mass of critics, however, have rejected this conjecture, as they have likewise negatived the fanciful ascription of the composition by Simon de Magistris to Papias of Hierapolis,[3] and by Bunsen to Hegesippus.[4] Such attempts to identify the unknown author are obviously mere speculation, and it is impossible to suppose that, had Papias, Hegesippus, or any other well-known writer of the same period composed such a list, Eusebius could have failed to refer to it, as so immediately relevant to the purpose of his work. Thiersch even expressed a suspicion that the fragment was a literary mystification on the part of Muratori himself.[5]

The mass of critics, with very little independent consideration, have taken literally the statement of the author regarding the composition of the *Shepherd* "very recently in our times" *(nuperrime temporibus nostris)*, during the Episcopate of Pius (A.D. 142–157), and have concluded the fragment to have been written towards the end of the second century, though we need scarcely say that a few writers would date it even earlier. On the other hand, and we consider with reason, many critics, including men who will not be accused of opposition to an early Canon, assign the composition to a later period, between the end of the second or beginning of the third century, and some even to the fourth century.

When we examine the ground upon which alone an early date can be supported, it becomes apparent how slight the foundation is. The only argument of any weight is the statement with regard to the composition of the *Shepherd;* but, with the exception of the few apologists who do not hesitate to assign a date totally inconsistent with the state of the Canon described in the fragment, the great majority of critics feel that they are forced to place the composition not earlier than the end of the second century, at a period when

[1] "*Pastorem vero nuperrime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Herma conscripsit sedente cathedra urbis Rome ecclesie Pio episcopus fratre ejus et ideo legi eum quidem oportet se publicare vero in ecclesia populo neque inter prophetas completum numero neque inter apostolos in fine temporum potest.*"

[2] *Antiq. Ital.*, iii., p. 854 f.; Gallandi, *Bibl. Vet. Patr.*, 1788, ii., p. xxxiii.; Freindaller, *apud* Routh, *Rel. Sacr.*, i., p. 401; cf. Hefele, *Patr. Ap. Proleg.*, p. lxiii.

[3] *Daniel secundum* LXX. 1772; *Dissert.*, iv., p. 467 f.

[4] *Analecta Ante-Nic.*, 1854, i., p. 125; *Hippolytus and his Age*, i., p. 314.

[5] *Versuch, u. s. w.*, p. 387.

the statements in the fragment may better agree with the actual opinions in the Church, and yet sufficiently accord with the expression, "very recently in our times," as applied to the period of Pius of Rome, 142–157. It must be evident that, taken literally, a very arbitrary interpretation is given to this indication, and in supposing that the writer may have appropriately used the phrase thirty or forty years after the time of Pius, so much license is taken that there is absolutely no reason why a still greater interval may not be allowed. With this sole exception, there is not a single word or statement in the fragment which would oppose our assigning the composition to a late period of the third century. Volkmar has very justly pointed out, however, that in saying "very recently in our times" the writer merely intended to distinguish the *Shepherd* of Hermas from the writings of the Prophets and Apostles: It cannot be classed amongst the Prophets whose number is complete, nor amongst the Apostles, inasmuch as it was only written in our post-apostolic time. This seems an accurate interpretation of the expression, which might with perfect propriety be used a century after the time of Pius. We have seen that there has not appeared a single trace of any Canon in the writings of the Fathers whom we have examined, and that the Old Testament has been the only Holy Scripture they have acknowledged; and it is therefore unsafe, upon the mere interpretation of an elastic phrase, to date this anonymous fragment earlier than the very end of the second or beginning of the third century, and it is still more probable that it was not written until an advanced period of the third century. The expression used with regard to Pius, "Sitting in the chair of the Church," is quite unprecedented in the second century or until a very much later date. It is argued that the fragment is imperfect, and that sentences have fallen out; and in regard to this, and to the assertion that it is a translation from the Greek, it has been well remarked by a writer whose judgment on the point will scarcely be called prejudiced: "If it is thus mutilated, why might it not also be interpolated? If, moreover, the translator was so ignorant of Latin, can we trust his translation? and what guarantee have we that he has not paraphrased and expanded the original? The force of these remarks is peculiarly felt in dealing with the paragraph which gives the date. The Pastor of Hermas was not well known to the Western Church, and it was not highly esteemed. It was regarded as inspired by the Eastern, and read in the Eastern Churches. We have seen, moreover, that it was extremely unlikely that Hermas was a real personage. It would be, therefore, far more probable that we have here an interpolation, or addition by a member of the Roman or African Church, probably by the translator, made expressly for the purpose of

serving as proof that the Pastor of Hermas was not inspired. The paragraph itself bears unquestionable marks of tampering,"[1] etc. It would take us too far were we to discuss the various statements of the fragment as indications of date, and the matter is not of sufficient importance. It contains nothing involving an earlier date than the third century.

The facts of the case may be briefly summed up as follows, so far as our object is concerned. The third Synoptic is mentioned by a totally unknown writer, at an unknown, but certainly not early, date—in all probability during the third century—in a fragment which we possess in a very corrupt version, much open to suspicion of interpolation in the precise part from which the early date is inferred. The Gospel is attributed to Luke, who was not one of the followers of Jesus, and of whom it is expressly said that "he himself had not seen the Lord in the flesh," but wrote "as he deemed best (*ex opinione*)," and followed his history as he was able (*et idem prout assequi potuit*).[2] If the fragment of Muratori, therefore, even came within our limits as to date, its evidence would be of no value, for, instead of establishing the trustworthiness and absolute accuracy of the narrative of the third Synoptic, it distinctly tends to discredit it, inasmuch as it declares it to be the composition of one who undeniably was not an eye-witness of the miracles reported, but collected his materials as best he could long after their supposed occurrence.[3]

We may now briefly sum up the results of our examination of the evidence for the synoptic Gospels. After having exhausted the literature and the testimony bearing on the point, we have not found a single distinct trace of any of those Gospels, with the exception of the third, during the first century and a half after the death of Jesus. Only once during the whole of that period do we find even a tradition that any of our Evangelists composed a Gospel at all, and that tradition, so far from favouring our Synoptics, is fatal to the claims of the first and second. Papias, about the middle of the second century, on the occasion to which

[1] Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 202.

[2] The passage is freely rendered thus by Dr. Westcott: "The Gospel of St. Luke, it is then said, stands third in order (in the Canon), having been written by 'Luke the physician,' the companion of St. Paul, who, not being himself an eye-witness, based his narrative on such information as he could obtain, beginning from the birth of John" (*On the Canon*, p. 187).

[3] We do not propose to consider the Ophites and Peratici, obscure Gnostic sects towards the end of the second century. There is no direct evidence regarding them, and the testimony of writers in the third century, like Hippolytus, is of no value for the Gospels. Further on, in connection with the Acts of the Apostles, we shall state reasons for ascribing a late date for the composition of the third Gospel.

we refer, records that Matthew composed the Discourses of the Lord in the Hebrew tongue, a statement which totally excludes the claim of our Greek Gospel to apostolic origin. Mark, he said, wrote down from the casual preaching of Peter the sayings and doings of Jesus, but without orderly arrangement, as he was not himself a follower of the Master, and merely recorded what fell from the Apostle. This description, likewise, shows that our actual second Gospel could not, in its present form, have been the work of Mark. There is no other reference during the period to any writing of Matthew or Mark, and no mention at all of any work ascribed to Luke. The identification of Marcion's Gospel with our third Synoptic proves the existence of that work before A.D. 140; but no evidence is thus obtained either as to the author or the character of his work: but, on the contrary, the testimony of the great heresiarch is so far unfavourable to that Gospel, as it involves a charge against it of being interpolated and debased by Jewish elements. The freedom with which Marcion expurgated and altered it clearly shows that he did not regard it either as a sacred or canonical work. Any argument for the mere existence of our Synoptics based upon their supposed rejection by heretical leaders and sects has the inevitable disadvantage that the very testimony which would show their existence would oppose their authenticity. There is no evidence of their use by heretical leaders, however, and no direct reference to them by any writer, heretical or orthodox, whom we have examined. If it be considered that the *Diatessaron* of Tatian is based upon our Synoptics, all that is established by the fact is their existence about the last quarter of the second century, and no appreciable addition is made to our knowledge of their authorship. It is unnecessary to add that no reason whatever has been shown for accepting the testimony of these Gospels as sufficient to establish the reality of miracles and of a direct Divine Revelation.[1] It is not pretended that more than one of the synoptic Gospels was written by an eye-witness of the miraculous occurrences reported; and, whilst no evidence has been, or can be, produced even of the historical accuracy of the narratives, no testimony as to the correctness of the inferences from the external phenomena exists, or is now even conceivable. The discrepancy between the amount of evidence required and that which is forthcoming, however, is greater than, under the circumstances, could have been thought possible.

[1] A comparison of the contents of the three Synoptics would have confirmed this conclusion; but this is not at present necessary.

PART III.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

CHAPTER I.

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

We shall now examine, in the same order, the witnesses already cited in connection with the Synoptics, and ascertain what evidence they furnish for the date and authenticity of the fourth Gospel.

Apologists do not even allege that there is any reference to the fourth Gospel in the so-called *Epistle of Clement of Rome* to the Corinthians.[1]

A few critics[2] pretend to find a trace of it in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, in the reference to the brazen Serpent as a type of Jesus. Tischendorf states the case as follows:—

"And when in the same chapter xii. it is shown how Moses, in the brazen serpent, made a type of Jesus 'who should suffer (die) and yet himself make alive,' the natural inference is that Barnabas connected therewith John iii. 14 f., even if the use of this passage in particular cannot be proved. Although this connection cannot be affirmed, since the author of the Epistle, in this passage as in many others, may be independent, yet it is justifiable to ascribe

[1] Dr. Westcott, however, cannot resist the temptation to press Clement into service. He says: "In other passages it is possible to trace the influence of St. John, 'The blood of Christ hath gained for the whole world the offer of the grace of repentance.' 'Through Him we look steadfastly on the heights of heaven; through Him we view as in a glass (ἐνοπτριζόμεθα) His spotless and most excellent visage; through Him the eyes of our heart were open; through Him our dull and darkened understanding is quickened with new vigour on turning to his marvellous light.'" He does not indicate more clearly the nature and marks of the "influence" to which he refers. As he also asserts that the Epistle "affirms the teaching of St. Paul and St. James," and that the Epistle to the Hebrews is "wholly transfused into Clement's mind," such an argument does not require a single remark (*On the Canon*, p. 23 f.).

[2] Lardner, Dr. Westcott, and others, do not refer to it at all.

the greatest probability to its dependence on the passage in John, as the tendency of the Epistle in no way required a particular leaning to the expression of John. The disproportionately more abundant use of express quotations from the Old Testament in Barnabas is, on the contrary, connected most intimately with the tendency of his whole composition."[1]

It will be observed that the suggestion of reference to the fourth Gospel is here advanced in a very hesitating way, and does not indeed go beyond an assertion of probability. We might, therefore, well leave the matter without further notice, as the reference in no case could be of any weight as evidence. On examination of the context, however, we find that there is every reason to conclude that the reference to the brazen serpent is made direct to the Old Testament. The author, who delights in typology, is bent upon showing that the cross is prefigured in the Old Testament. He gives a number of instances, involving the necessity for a display of ridiculous ingenuity of explanation, which should prepare us to find the type of the brazen serpent naturally selected. After pointing out that Moses, with his arms stretched out in prayer that the Israelites might prevail in the fight, was a type of the cross, he goes on to say: "Again Moses makes a type of Jesus, that he must suffer and himself make alive (καὶ αὐτὸς ζωοποιήσει), whom they will appear to have destroyed, in a figure, while Israel was falling";[2] and connecting the circumstance that the people were bit by serpents and died with the transgression of Eve by means of the serpent, he goes on to narrate minutely the story of Moses and the brazen serpent, and then winds up with the words: "Thou hast in this the glory of Jesus; that in him are all things and for him."[3] No one can read the whole passage carefully without seeing that the reference is direct to the Old Testament. There is no ground for supposing that the author was acquainted with the fourth Gospel.

To the *Shepherd* of Hermas Tischendorf devotes only two lines, in which he states that "it has neither quotations from the Old nor from the New Testament." Dr. Westcott makes the same statement,[4] but, unlike the German apologist, he proceeds subsequently to affirm that Hermas makes "clear allusions to St. John," which few or no apologists support. This assertion he elaborates and illustrates as follows:—

"The view which Hermas gives of Christ's nature and work is no less harmonious with apostolic doctrine, and it offers striking analogies to the Gospel of St. John. Not only did the Son 'appoint angels to preserve each of those whom the Father gave

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, 96 f.
[2] Ch. xii.
[3] Ch. xii.; cf. Heb. ii. 10; Rom. xi. 36.
[4] *On the Canon*, p. 175.

to him,' but 'He himself toiled very much and suffered very much to cleanse our sins.....And so when he himself had cleansed the sins of the people, he showed them the paths of life by giving them the Law which he received from his Father.'[1] He is 'a Rock higher than the mountains, able to hold the whole world; ancient, and yet having a new gate.'[2] 'His name is great and infinite, and the whole world is supported by him.'[3] 'He is older than Creation, so that he took counsel with the Father about the creation which he made.'[4] 'He is the sole way of access to the Lord; and no one shall enter in unto him otherwise than by his Son.'"[5]

This is all Dr. Westcott says on the subject.[6] He does not attempt to point out any precise portions of the fourth Gospel with which to compare these "striking analogies," nor does he produce any instances of similarity of language, or of the use of the same terminology as the Gospel in this apocalyptic allegory. It is clear that such evidence could in no case be of any value for the fourth Gospel.

When we examine more closely, however, it becomes certain that these passages possess no real analogy with the fourth Gospel, and were not derived from it. There is no part of them that has not close parallels in writings antecedent to our Gospel, and there is no use of terminology peculiar to it. The author does not even once use the term Logos. Dr. Westcott makes no mention of the fact that the doctrine of the Logos and of the pre-existence of Jesus was enunciated long before the composition of the fourth Gospel, with almost equal clearness and fulness, and that its development can be traced through the Septuagint translation, the "Proverbs of Solomon," some of the Apocryphal works of the Old Testament, the writings of Philo, the Apocalypse, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, as well as the Pauline Epistles. To any one who examines the passages cited from the work of Hermas, and still more to any one acquainted with the history of the Logos doctrine, it will, we fear, seem wasted time to enter upon any minute refutation of such imaginary "analogies." We shall, however, as briefly as possible refer to each passage quoted.

The first is taken from an elaborate similitude with regard to true fasting, in which the world is likened to a vineyard, and, in explaining his parable, the Shepherd says: "God planted the vineyard; that is, he created the people and gave them to his Son: and the Son appointed his angels over them to keep them: and he himself cleansed their sins, having suffered many things and endured many labours.....He himself, therefore, having cleansed

[1] *Simil.*, v. 6. [2] *Ib.*, ix. 2, 12. [3] *Ib.*, ix. 14.
[4] *Ib.*, ix. 12, quoted above. [5] *Ib.*, ix. 12. [6] *On the Canon*, p. 177 f.

the sins of the people, showed them the paths of life by giving them the Law which he received from his Father."[1]

It is difficult indeed to find anything in this passage which is in the slightest degree peculiar to the fourth Gospel, or apart from the whole teaching of the Epistles, and more especially the Epistle to the Hebrews. We may point out a few passages for comparison: Heb. i. 2–4; ii. 10–11; v. 8–9; vii. 12, 17–19; viii. 6–10; x. 10–16; Romans viii. 14–17; Matt. xxi. 33; Mark xii. 1; Isaiah v. 7, liii.

The second passage is taken from a similar parable on the building of the Church: (α) "And in the middle of the plain he showed me a great white rock which had risen out of the plain, and the rock was higher than the mountains, rectangular so as to be able to hold the whole world, but that rock was old, having a gate (πύλη) hewn out of it, and the hewing out of the gate (πύλη) seemed to me to be recent."[2] Upon this rock the tower of the Church is built. Further on an explanation is given of the similitude, in which occurs another of the passages referred to. (β) "This rock (πέτρα) and this gate (πύλη) are the Son of God. 'How, Lord,' I said, 'is the rock old and the gate new?' 'Listen,' he said, 'and understand, thou ignorant man. (γ) The Son of God is older than all of his creation (ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ προγενέστερός ἐστιν), so that he was a councillor with the Father in his work of creation; and for this is he old.' (δ) 'And why is the gate new, Lord?' I said. 'Because,' he replied, 'he was manifested in the last days (ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν) of the dispensation; for this cause the gate was made new, in order that they who shall be saved might enter by it into the kingdom of God.'"[3]

And a few lines lower down the *Shepherd* further explains, referring to entrance through the gate, and introducing another of the passages cited: (ε) "'In this way,' he said, 'no one shall enter into the kingdom of God unless he receive his holy name. If, therefore, you cannot enter into the City unless through its gate, so also,' he said, 'a man cannot enter in any other way into the kingdom of God than by the name of his Son beloved by him'..... 'and the gate (πύλη) is the Son of God. This is the one entrance to the Lord.' In no other way, therefore, shall any one enter in to him, except through his Son."[4]

With regard to the similitude of a rock, we need scarcely say that the Old Testament teems with it; and we need not point to the parable of the house built upon a rock in the first Gospel.[5]

[1] *Simil.*, v. 6. [2] *Ib.*, ix. 2.
[3] *Ib.*, ix. 12. Philo represents the Logos as a rock (πέτρα). *Quod det. potiori insid.*, § 31, Mangey, i. 213.
[4] *Simil.*, ix. 12. [5] Matt. vii. 24.

A more apt illustration is the famous saying with regard to Peter: "And upon this rock (πέτρα) I will build my Church," upon which, indeed, the whole similitude of Hermas turns; and in 1 Cor. x. 4 we read: "For they drank of the Spiritual Rock accompanying them; but the Rock was Christ" (ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός). There is no such similitude in the fourth Gospel at all.

We then have the "gate," on which we presume Dr. Westcott chiefly relies. The parable in John x. 1-9 is quite different from that of Hermas,[1] and there is a persistent use of different terminology. The door into the sheepfold is always θύρα, the gate in the rock always πύλη. "I am the door"[2] (ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα) is twice repeated in the fourth Gospel. "The gate is the Son of God" (ἡ πύλη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν) is the declaration of Hermas. On the other hand, there are numerous passages, elsewhere, analogous to that in the *Shepherd* of Hermas. Every one will remember the injunction in the Sermon on the Mount: Matt, vii. 13, 14. "Enter in through the strait gate (πύλη), for wide is the gate (πύλη), etc., 14. Because narrow is the gate (πύλη) and straitened is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."[3] The limitation to the one way of entrance into the kingdom of God, "by the name of his Son," is also found everywhere throughout the Epistles, and likewise in the Acts of the Apostles; as, for instance, Acts iv. 12: "And there is no salvation in any other: for neither is there any other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

The reasons given why the rock is old and the gate new (γ, δ) have anything but special analogy with the fourth Gospel. We are, on the contrary, taken directly to the Epistle to the Hebrews in which the pre-existence of Jesus is prominently asserted, and between which and the *Shepherd*, as in a former passage, we find singular linguistic analogies. For instance, take the whole opening portion of Heb. i. 1: "God having at many times and in many manners spoken in times past to the fathers by the prophets, 2. At the end of these days (ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων) spake to us in the Son whom he appointed heir (κληρονόμος)[4] of all things, by whom he also made the worlds, 3. Who being

[1] Cf. Heb. ix. 24, 11-12, etc. [2] John x. 7, 9.

[3] Compare the account of the new Jerusalem, Rev. xxi. 12 f.; cf. xxii. 4, 14. In *Simil.* ix. 13 it is insisted that, to enter into the kingdom, not only "his name" must be borne, but that we must put on certain clothing.

[4] We may remark that in the parable Hermas speaks of the son as the heir (κληρονόμος), and of the slave—who is the true son—also as co-heir (συγκληρονόμος), and a few lines below the passage above quoted, of the heirship (κληρονομίας). This is another indication of the use of this Epistle, the peculiar expression in regard to the son "whom he appointed heir (κληρονόμος) of all things" occurring here (cf. *Simil.*, v. 2, 6).

the brightness of his glory and the express image of his substance, upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had made by himself a cleansing of our sins sat down at the right hand of Majesty on high, 4. Having become so much better than the angels,"[1] etc.; and if we take the different clauses we may also find them elsewhere constantly repeated, as for instance: (γ) The son older than all his creation: compare 2 Tim. i., 9, Col. i. 15 ("who is.....the first born of all creation"—ὃς ἐστιν..... πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως), 16, 17, 18, Rev. iii. 14, x. 6. The works of Philo are full of this representation of the Logos. For example: "For the Word of God is over all the universe, and the oldest and most universal of all things created" (καὶ ὁ Λόγος δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπεράνω παντός ἐστι τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ πρεσβύτατος καὶ γενικώτατος των ὅσα γέγονε).[2] Again, as to the second clause, that he assisted the Father in the work of creation, compare Heb. ii. 10, i. 2, xi. 3, Rom. xi. 36, 1 Cor. viii. 6, Col. i 15, 16.[3]

The only remaining passage is the following: "The name of the Son of God is great and infinite, and supports the whole world." For the first phrase, compare 2 Tim. iv. 18, Heb. i. 8; and for the second part of the sentence, Heb. i. 3, Col. i. 17, and many other passages quoted above.[4]

The whole assertion[5] is devoid of foundation, and might well have been left unnoticed. The attention called to it, however, may not be wasted in observing the kind of evidence with which apologists are compelled to be content.

It would scarcely be necessary to refer to *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* in connection with the fourth Gospel, for no critic that we are aware of has claimed that it contains any

[1] Heb. i. 1 f.

[2] *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., § 61, Mangey, i., p. 121; cf. *De Confus. Ling.*, § 28, Mang., i., p. 427, § 14, *ib.*, i., p. 414; *De Profugis*, § 19, Mang., i. 561; *De Caritate*, § 2, Mang., ii. 385, etc. The Logos is constantly called by Philo "the first-begotten of God" (πρωτόγονος Θεοῦ Λόγος); "the most ancient son of God" (πρεσβύτατος υἱὸς Θεοῦ).

[3] Cf. Philo, *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., § 31, Mangey, i. 106; *De Cherubim*, § 35, Mang., i. 162, etc.

[4] Cf. Philo, *De Profugis*, § 20, Mangey, i. 562; Frag. Mangey, ii. 655; *De Somniis*, i., § 41, Mang., i. 656.

[5] Dr. Westcott also says: "In several places also St. John's teaching on 'the Truth' lies at the ground of Hermas' words," and in a note he refers to "*Mand.* iii. - 1 John ii. 27; iv. 6," without specifying any passage of the book (*On the Canon*, p. 176, and note 4). Such unqualified assertions unsupported by any evidence cannot be too strongly condemned. Dr. Westcott's own words may be quoted against himself: "It is impossible to exaggerate the mischief done by these vague general statements, which produce a permanent impression wholly out of proportion with the minute element of truth which is hidden in them" (*On the Canon*, 4th ed., p. 156, n. 1).

quotation from that Gospel; but a few consider that in parts it exhibits a Johannine spirit which seems to indicate at least acquaintance with the fourth Gospel. This is said to be chiefly or only found in the Eucharistic prayers of the Didache ix. and x., and it may, therefore, be well to say a few words on the subject. In x. 2, the principal passage, we read: "We thank thee, holy Father, for thy holy name which thou hast caused to dwell (*κατεσκήνωσας*) in our hearts." This verse is supposed by those who entertain the Johannine theory to be connected with John i. 14: "The Word dwelt (*ἐσκήνωσεν*) amongst us," and reliance is specially placed on the use of this verb—not a very strong basis upon which to rest such a theory. Dr. Taylor has pointed out, however, that instead of there being no precedent for the transitive sense of the Greek word *κατασκηνόω*, to *make to dwell*, it is found in the Septuagint version of Jeremiah vii. 12: "But go ye now unto my place which was in Shiloh, where I *caused my name to dwell* (*οὗ κατεσκήνωσα τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐκεῖ ἔμπροσθεν*)."[1] It is all the more appropriate to find this passage in Jeremiah, as the germ of the "Two Ways," from which the Didache has grown, is also derived from the same prophet, xxi. 8. A similar phrase occurs in Neh. ii. 9, "and will bring them unto the place that I have chosen to cause my name to dwell there" (*κατεσκηνῶσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐκεῖ*).

With regard to the Eucharistic prayer which we have quoted, Dr. Taylor says: "The Thanksgiving opens with a simple Hebraism";[2] and, treating generally of the Eucharistic passage of the Didache, Mr. Rendel Harris has rightly and ably pointed out: "The prayers are full of reminiscence of the Jewish Passover ritual, and capable of direct illustration from the Jewish Service-books of the present day; and even in those parts of the thanksgiving where no direct parallel can be made the language of the teaching is utterly Jewish. Take, for example, the rule of prayer given in *Berachoth* f. 40 b: 'All blessing in which there is no mention of the *Name* is not a blessing';.....And the 'Name' is found in the expression, 'Thy holy Name which thou hast caused to dwell in our hearts.' Nothing could be more evidently Jewish."[3]

This practically disposes of the allegation which we are examining, and, for the rest, if this anonymous work had really any reminiscences of the fourth Gospel, which can fully be denied, these could do nothing to establish its authenticity or value as testimony for miracles.

Tischendorf points out two passages in the *Epistles of pseudo-*

[1] *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, p. 73 f.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 73. [3] *The Teaching of the Apostles*, p. 89.

Ignatius which, he considers, show the use of the fourth Gospel.[1] They are as follows—Epistle to the Romans vii.: "I desire the bread of God, the bread of heaven, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ the son of God, who was born at a later time of the seed of David and Abraham; and I desire the drink of God (*πόμα θεοῦ*), that is his blood, which is love incorruptible, and eternal life" (*ἀέναος ζωή*).[2] This is compared with John vi. 41: "I am the bread which came down from heaven," 48....."I am the bread of life," 51....."And the bread that I will give is my flesh"; 54. "He who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life" (*ζωὴν αἰώνιον*). Scholten has pointed out that the reference to Jesus as "born of the seed of David and Abraham" is not in the spirit of the fourth Gospel; and the use of *πόμα θεοῦ* for the *πόσις* of vi. 55, and *ἀέναος ζωή* instead of *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, are also opposed to the connection with that Gospel.[3] On the other hand, in the institution of the Supper, the bread is described as the body of Jesus, and the wine as his blood; and reference is made there, and elsewhere, to eating bread and drinking wine in the kingdom of God,[4] and the passage seems to be nothing but a development of this teaching.[5] Nothing could be proved by such an analogy.

The second passage referred to by Tischendorf is in the Epistle to the Philadelphians vii.: "For if some would have led me astray according to the flesh, yet the Spirit is not led astray, being from God, for it knoweth whence it cometh and whither it goeth, and detecteth the things that are hidden."[6] Tischendorf considers that these words are based upon John iii. 6–8, and the last phrase, "And detecteth the hidden things," upon verse 20. The sense of the Epistle, however, is precisely the reverse of that of the Gospel, which reads: "The wind bloweth where it listeth; and thou hearest the sound thereof, but *knowest not* whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit";[7] whilst the Epistle does not refer to the wind at all, but affirms that the Spirit of God does know whence it cometh, etc. The analogy in verse 20 is still more remote: "For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be detected."[8] In 1 Cor. ii. 10 the sense is found more closely: "For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, even the deep things of God."[9] It is evidently unreasonable to assert from such a passage

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 22 f. Lücke does not attach much weight to any of the supposed allusions in these Epistles (*Comm. Ev. Joh.*, i., p. 43; cf. Sanday, *Gospels in Sec. Cen.*, p. 273 f.).

[2] *Ad Rom.*, vii. [3] *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 54.

[4] Matt. xxvi. 26–29; Mark xiv. 22–25; Luke xxii. 17–20; 1 Cor. xi. 23–25; cf. Luke xiv. 15.

[5] Cf. Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 54. [6] *Ad Philadelph.*, vii.

[7] John iii. 8. [8] John iii. 20. [9] 1 Cor. ii. 10.

the use of the fourth Gospel. Even Tischendorf recognises that in themselves the phrases which he points out in *Pseudo-Ignatius* could not, unsupported by other corroboration, possess much weight as testimony for the use of our Gospels. He says: "Were these allusions of Ignatius to Matthew and John a wholly isolated phenomenon, and one which perhaps other undoubted results of inquiry wholly contradicted, they would hardly have any conclusive weight. But——."[1] Dr. Westcott says: The "Ignatian writings, as might be expected, are not without traces of the influence of St. John. The circumstances in which he was placed required a special enunciation of Pauline doctrine; but this is not so expressed as to exclude the parallel lines of Christian thought. Love is 'the stamp of the Christian' (*Ad Magn.* v.). 'Faith is the beginning and love the end of life' (*Ad Ephes.* xiv.). 'Faith is our guide upward' (ἀναγωγεύς), but love is the road that 'leads to God' (*Ad Eph.* ix.). 'The Eternal (ἄϊδιος) Word is the manifestation of God' (*Ad Magn.* viii.), 'the door by which we come to the Father' (*Ad Philad.* ix., cf. John x. 7), 'and without Him we have not the principle of true life' (*Ad Trall.* ix.: οὗ χωρὶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν. cf. *Ad Eph.* iii.: Ἰ.Χ. τὸ ἀδιάκριτον ἡμῶν ζῆν). The true meat of the Christian is the 'bread of God, the bread of heaven, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ,' and his drink is 'Christ's blood, which is love incorruptible' (*Ad Rom.* vii., cf. John vi. 32, 51, 53). He has no love of this life; 'his love has been crucified, and he has in him no burning passion for the world, but living water (as the spring of a new life), speaking within him, and bidding him come to his Father' (*Ad Rom.* l. c.). Meanwhile his enemy is the enemy of his Master, even the 'ruler of this age' (*Ad Rom.* l. c., ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. Cf. John xii. 31, xvi. 11: ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου· and see 1 Cor. ii. 6, 8[2])."

Part of these references we have already considered; others of them really do not require any notice, and the only one to which we need direct our attention for a moment may be the passage from the Epistle to the Philadelphians ix., which reads: "He is the Door of the Father, by which enter in Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and the prophets, and the apostles, and the Church."[3] This is compared with John x. 7. "Therefore said Jesus again: Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the Sheep" (ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων). We have already referred, a few pages back,[4] to the image of the door. Here again it is obvious that there is a marked difference in the sense of the Epistle from

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 23.

[2] Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 32 f., and notes. We have inserted in the text the references given in the notes.

[3] *Ad Philad.*, ix.

[4] P. 438 f.

that of the Gospel. In the latter Jesus is said to be the door into the Sheepfold;[1] whilst in the Epistle he is the door into the Father, through which not only the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles enter, but also the Church itself. Such distant analogy cannot warrant the conclusion that the passage shows any acquaintance with the fourth Gospel. As for the other phrases, they are not only without special bearing upon the fourth Gospel, but they are everywhere found in the canonical Epistles, as well as elsewhere. Regarding love and faith, for instance, compare Gal. v. 6, 14, 22; Rom. xii. 9, 10, viii. 39, xiii. 9; 1 Cor. ii. 9, viii. 3; Ephes. iii. 17, v. 1, 2, vi. 23; Philip. i. 9, ii. 2; 2 Thess. iii. 5; 1 Tim. i. 14, vi. 11; 2 Tim. i. 13; Heb. x. 38 f., xi., etc.

We might point out many equally close analogies in the works of Philo,[2] but it is unnecessary to do so, although we may indicate one or two which first present themselves. Philo equally has "the Eternal Logos" (ὁ ἀΐδιος Λόγος),[3] whom he represents as the manifestation of God in every way. "The Word is the likeness of God, by whom the universe was created" (Λόγος δέ ἐστιν εἰκὼν θεοῦ, δι' οὗ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο).[4] He is "the vicegerent" (ὕπαρχος) of God,[5] "the heavenly incorruptible food of the soul," "the bread (ἄρτος) from heaven." In one place he says: "and they who inquired what is the food of the soul..... learnt at last that it is the word of God, and the Divine Logos..... This is the heavenly nourishment, and it is mentioned in the holy Scriptures.....saying, 'Lo! I rain upon you bread (ἄρτος) from heaven' (Exod. xvi. 4). 'This is the bread (ἄρτος) which the Lord has given them to eat'" (Exod. xvi. 15).[6] And again: "For the one indeed raises his eyes towards the sky, contemplating the manna, the divine Word, the heavenly incorruptible food of the longing soul."[7] Elsewhere: ".....but it is taught by the Hierophant and Prophet Moses, who will say: 'This is the bread (ἄρτος), the nourishment which God gave to the soul'—that he offered his own Word and his own Logos; for this is bread (ἄρτος) which he

[1] Compare the whole passage, John x. 1–16.

[2] Philo's birth is dated at least twenty to thirty years before our era, and his death about A.D. 40. His principal works were certainly written before his embassy to Caius. Dähne, *Gesch. Darstell. jüd. alex. Religions-Philos.*, 1834, 1 abth., p. 98, anm. 2: Delaunay, *Philon d'Alexandrie*, 1867, p. 11 f.; Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vi., p. 239; Gfrörer, *Gesch. des Urchristenthums*, i., p. 5, p. 37 f., p. 45.

[3] *De plant. Noe*, § 5, Mang., i. 332; *De Mundo*, § 2, Mang., ii. 604.

[4] *De Monarchia*, ii., § 5; Mang., ii. 225.

[5] *De Agricult.*, § 12, Mang., i. 308; *De Somniis*, i., § 41, Mang., i. 656; cf. Coloss. i. 15; Heb. i. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 4.

[6] *De Profugis*, § 25, Mang., i. 566.

[7] *Quis rerum Div. Heres.*, § 15, Mang., i. 484; *Quod det. potiori insid.*, § 31, Mang., i. 213.

has given us to eat, this is the Word (τὸ ῥῆμα)."[1] He also says: "Therefore he exhorts him that can run swiftly to strive with breathless eagerness towards the Divine Word, who is, above all things, the fountain of Wisdom, in order that, by drinking of the stream, instead of death he may for his reward obtain eternal life."[2] It is the Logos who guides us to the Father, God "by the same Logos both creating all things and leading up (ἀνάγων) the perfect man from the things of earth to himself."[3] These are very imperfect examples, but it may be asserted that there is not a representation of the Logos in the fourth Gospel which has not close parallels in the works of Philo.

We have given these passages of the *Pseudo-Ignatian Epistles* which are pointed out as indicating acquaintance with the fourth Gospel, in order that the whole case might be stated and appreciated. The analogies are too distant to prove anything, but were they fifty times more close, they could do little or nothing to establish an early origin for the fourth Gospel, and nothing at all to elucidate the question as to its character and authorship.[4] The Epistles in which the passages occur are spurious, and of no value as evidence for the fourth Gospel. Only one of them is found in the three Syriac Epistles. We have already stated the facts connected with the so-called *Epistles of Ignatius*,[5] and no one who has attentively examined them can fail to see that the testimony of such documents cannot be considered of any historic weight, except for a period when evidence of the use of the fourth Gospel ceases to be of any significance.

It is not pretended that the so-called *Epistle of Polycarp* to the Philippians contains any references to the fourth Gospel. Tischendorf, however, affirms that it is weighty testimony for that Gospel, inasmuch as he discovers in it a certain trace of the first "Epistle of John"; and, as he maintains that the Epistle and the Gospel are the works of the same author, any evidence for the one is at the same time evidence for the other.[6] We shall hereafter consider the point of the common authorship of the Epistles and fourth Gospel, and here confine ourselves chiefly to the alleged fact of the reference. The passage to which Tischendorf alludes we subjoin, with the supposed parallel in the Epistle.

[1] *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., § 60, Mang., i. 121; cf. *ib.*, §§ 61, 62.

[2] *De Profugis*, § 18, Mang., i. 560.

[3] *De Sacrif. Abelis et Caini*, § 3; Mang., i. 165.

[4] In general the Epistles follow the Synoptic narratives, and not the account of the fourth Gospel. See, for instance, the reference to the anointing of Jesus, *Ad Eph.* xvii., cf. Matt. xxvi. 7 f.; Mark xiv. 3 f., cf. John xii. 1 f.

[5] P. 158 f.

[6] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 24 f.

EPISTLE OF POLYCARP, VII.

For whosoever doth not confess that Jesus Christ hath come in the flesh is Antichrist, and whosoever doth not confess the martyrdom of the cross is of the devil, and whosoever doth pervert the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts, and saith that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, he is a firstborn of Satan.

Πᾶς γὰρ, ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ. Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστιν· καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν· καὶ ὃς ἂν μεθοδεύῃ τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας, καὶ λέγει μήτε ἀνάστασιν μήτε κρίσιν, οὗτος πρωτότοκός ἐστι τοῦ Σατανᾶ.

1 EPISTLE OF JOHN, IV. 3.

And every spirit that confesseth not the Lord Jesus come in the flesh is not of God, and this is the (*spirit*) of Antichrist of which ye have heard that it cometh, and now already it is in the world.

Καὶ παν πνεῦμα ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν κύριον ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν, καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, ὅ τι ἀκηκόαμεν ὅτι ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν ἤδη.[1]

This passage does not occur as a quotation, and the utmost that can be said of the few words with which it opens is that a phrase somewhat resembling, but at the same time materially differing from, the Epistle of John is interwoven with the text of the *Epistle to the Philippians*. If this were really a quotation from the canonical Epistle, it would indeed be singular that, considering the supposed relations of Polycarp and John, the name of the apostle should not have been mentioned, and a quotation have been distinctly and correctly made. On the other hand, there is no earlier trace of the canonical Epistle, and, as Volkmar argues, it may be doubted whether it may not rather be dependent on the *Epistle to the Philippians*, than the latter upon the Epistle of John.[2]

We believe, with Scholten, that neither is dependent on the other, but that both adopted a formula in use in the early Church

[1] We give the text of the *Sinaitic Codex* as the most favourable. A great majority of the other MSS., and all the more important, present very marked difference from this reading. [In reference to this, Dr. Westcott has the following note in the 4th edition of his work, *On the Canon*, p. 50, n. 2: "The author of *Supernatural Religion* gives (ii., p. 268) a good example of the facility with which similar phrases are mixed up, when, with the Greek text of St. John before him, he quotes as '1 John iv. 3,' καὶ παν πνεῦμα, κ. τ. λ. (quoting the passage in the text above). Is this also taken from an apocryphal writing?" No, as was clearly stated in the note, it is taken from the *Codex Sinaiticus*. Dr. Westcott ought to have observed this. At the end of his volume, in a page of "addenda," he says: "I should have added that the singular combination of phrases which is quoted is taken from *Cod. Sin.* The words, as they stand, are liable to be misunderstood." In this he does himself injustice. It would not be easy to misunderstand the sarcastic question, and still less the curious addition made when his mistake was pointed out to him.]

[2] Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 48 f.

against various heresies,[1] the superficial coincidence of which is without any weight as evidence for the use of either Epistle by the writer of the other. Moreover, it is clear that the writers refer to different classes of heretics. Polycarp attacks the Docetæ who deny that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh, that is with a human body of flesh and blood; whilst the Epistle of John is directed against those who deny that Jesus who has come in the flesh is the Christ the Son of God.[2] Volkmar points out that in Polycarp the word "Antichrist" is made a proper name, whilst in the Epistle the expression used is the abstract "Spirit of Anti-Christ." Polycarp, in fact, says that whoever denies the flesh of Christ is no Christian but anti-Christ, and Volkmar finds this direct assertion more original than the assertion of the Epistle: "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God,"[3] etc. In any case it seems to us clear that in both writings we have only the independent enunciation, with decided difference of language and sense, of a formula current in the Church, and that neither writer can be held to have originated the condemnation, in these words, of heresies which the Church had begun vehemently to oppose, and which were merely an application of ideas already well known, as we see from the expression of the Epistle in reference to the Spirit of Antichrist, "of which ye have heard that it cometh." Whether this phrase be an allusion to the Apocalypse xiii., or to 2 Thess. ii., or to traditions current in the Church, we need not inquire; it is sufficient that the Epistle of John avowedly applies a prophecy regarding Antichrist already known amongst Christians, which was equally open to the other writer, and probably familiar in the Church. This cannot under any circumstances be admitted as evidence of weight for the use of the first Epistle of John. There is no evidence of the existence of the Epistles ascribed to John previous to this date, and their origin would have to be established on sure grounds before the argument we are considering can have any value.

On the other hand, we have already seen[4] that there is strong reason to doubt the authenticity of the Epistle attributed to Polycarp, and certainty that in any case it is, in its present form, considerably interpolated. Even if genuine in any part, the use of the first Epistle of John, if established, could not be of much value as testimony for the fourth Gospel, of which the writing does

[1] Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 45 f.; cf. Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 48 f.; cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 24, § 4; pseudo-Ignatius, *Ad Smyrn.*, v., vi.

[2] Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 46 f.; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 48 f.; cf. 1 John ii. 22; iv. 2, 3; v. 1, 5 f.

[3] Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 49 f.; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 46 f.

[4] P. 175 f.

not show a trace. So far from there being any evidence that Polycarp knew the fourth Gospel, however, everything points to the opposite conclusion. About A.D. 154 155 we find them taking part in the Paschal controversy,[1] contradicting the statements of the fourth Gospel,[2] and supporting the Synoptic view, contending that the Christian festival should be celebrated on the 14th Nisan, the day on which he affirmed that the Apostle John himself had observed it.[3] Irenæus, who represents Polycarp as the disciple of John, says of him: "For neither was Anicetus able to persuade Polycarp not to observe it (on the 14th) because he had always observed it with John the disciple of our Lord, and with the rest of the apostles with whom he consorted."[4] Not only, therefore, does Polycarp not refer to the fourth Gospel, but he is, on the contrary, an important witness against it as the work of John, for he represents that apostle as practically contradicting the Gospel of which he is said to be the author.

The fulness with which we have discussed the character of the evangelical quotations of *Justin Martyr* renders the task of ascertaining whether his works indicate any acquaintance with the fourth Gospel comparatively easy. The detailed statements already made enable us without preliminary explanation directly to attack the problem, and we are freed from the necessity of making extensive quotations to illustrate the facts of the case.

Whilst apologists assert with some boldness that Justin made use of our Synoptics, they are evidently, and with good reason, less confident in maintaining his acquaintance with the fourth Gospel. Dr. Westcott states: "His references to St. John are uncertain; but this, as has been already remarked, follows from the character of the fourth Gospel. It was unlikely that he should quote its peculiar teaching in apologetic writings addressed to Jews and heathens; and at the same time he exhibits types of language and doctrine which, if not immediately drawn from St. John, yet mark the presence of his influence and the recognition of his authority."[5] This apology for the neglect of the fourth

[1] The date has, hitherto, generally been fixed at A.D. 160, but the recent investigations referred to, p. 175 f., have led to the adoption of this earlier date, and the visit to Rome must, therefore, probably have taken place just after the accession of Anicetus to the Roman bishopric (cf. Lipsius, *Zeitschr. w. Theol.*, 1874, p. 205 f.).

[2] John xiii. 1, xvii. 28, xix. 14, 31; cf. Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 8.

[3] Cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 4; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 14, v. 24.

[4] Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 24.

[5] *On the Canon*, p. 145. In a note Dr. Westcott refers to Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 253 f. Credner, however, pronounces against the use of the fourth Gospel by Justin. Dr. Westcott adds the singular argument: "Justin's acquaintance with the Valentinians proves that the Gospel could not have

Gospel illustrates the obvious scantiness of the evidence furnished by Justin.

Tischendorf, however, with his usual temerity, claims Justin as a powerful witness for the fourth Gospel. He says: "According to our judgment there are convincing grounds of proof for the fact that John also was known and used by Justin, provided that unprejudiced consideration be not made to give way to antagonistic predilection against the Johannine Gospel." In order fully and fairly to state the case which he puts forward, we shall quote his own words, but to avoid repetition we shall permit ourselves to interrupt him by remarks and by parallel passages from other writings for comparison with Justin. Tischendorf says: "The representation of the person of Christ, altogether peculiar to John, as it is given particularly in his prologue i. 1 ('In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God'), and verse 14 ('and the word became flesh'), in the designation of him as Logos, as the word of God, unmistakably re-echoes in not a few passages in Justin; for instance: 'And Jesus Christ is alone the special Son begotten by God, being his Word and first-begotten and power.'"[1]

With this we may compare another passage of Justin from the second Apology. "But his son, who alone is rightly called Son, the Word before the works of creation, who was both with him and begotten when in the beginning he created and ordered all things by him,"[2] etc.

Now the same words and ideas are to be found throughout the Canonical Epistles and other writings, as well as in earlier works. In the Apocalypse,[3] the only book of the New Testament mentioned by Justin, and which is directly ascribed by him to John,[4] the term Logos is applied to Jesus "the Lamb" (xix. 13); "and his name is called the Word of God" (*καὶ κέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὁ Λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*). Elsewhere (iii. 14) he is called "the Beginning of the Creation of God" (*ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ*); and again in the same book (i. 5) he is "the first-begotten of the

been unknown to him" (*Dial.* 35). We have already proved that there is no evidence that Valentinus and his earlier followers knew anything of our Synoptics, and we shall presently show that this is likewise the case with the fourth Gospel.

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 32. Καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς μόνος ἰδίως υἱὸς τῷ θεῷ γεγέννηται, Λόγος αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων καὶ πρωτότοκος καὶ δύναμις. *Apol.*, i. 23.

[2] Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκείνου, ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υἱὸς, ὁ Λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων, καὶ συνὼν καὶ γεννώμενος, ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἔκτισε καὶ ἐκόσμησε. *Apol.*, ii. 6.

[3] Written *c.* A.D. 68–69; Credner, *Einl. N. T.*, i., p. 704 f.; *Beiträge*, ii., p. 294; Lücke, *Comm. Offenb. Joh.*, 1852, ii., p. 840 ff.; Ewald, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, 1852–53, p. 182; *Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vi., p. 643, etc.

[4] *Dial.* 81.

dead" (ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν). In Heb. i. 6 he is the "first-born" (πρωτότοκος), as in Coloss. i. 15 he is "the first-born of every creature" (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως); and in 1 Cor. i. 24 we have: "Christ the Power of God and the Wisdom of God" (Χριστὸν θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν), and it will be remembered that "Wisdom" was the earlier term which became an alternative with "Word" for the intermediate Being. In Heb. i. 2 God is represented as speaking to us "in the Son.....by whom he also made the worlds" (ἐν υἱῷ,.....δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας). In 2 Tim. i. 9 he is "before all worlds" (πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων), cf. Heb. i. 10, ii. 10, Rom. xi. 36, 1 Cor. viii. 6, Ephes. iii. 9.

The works of Philo are filled with similar representations of the Logos, but we must restrict ourselves to a very few. God as a Shepherd and King governs the universe, "having appointed his true Logos, his first begotten Son, to have the care of this sacred flock, as the Vicegerent of a great King."[1] In another place Philo exhorts men to strive to become like God's "first begotten Word" (τὸν πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ Λόγον),[2] and he adds, a few lines further on: "for the most ancient Word is the image of God" (θεοῦ γὰρ εἰκὼν Λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτατος). The high priest of God in the world is "the divine Word, his first-begotten son" (ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος Λόγος).[3] Speaking of the creation of the world, Philo says: "The instrument by which it was formed is the Word of God" (ὄργανον δὲ Λόγον θεοῦ, δι' οὗ κατεσκευάσθη).[4] Elsewhere: "For the word is the image of God by which the whole world was created" (Λόγος δέ ἐστιν εἰκὼν θεοῦ, δι' οὗ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο).[5] These passages might be indefinitely multiplied.

Tischendorf's next passage is: "The first power (δύναμις) after the Father of all and God the Lord, and Son, is the Word (Logos); in what manner having been made flesh (σαρκοποιηθεὶς) he became man, we shall in what follows relate."[6]

We find everywhere parallels for this passage without seeking them in the fourth Gospel. In 1 Cor. i. 24, "Christ the Power (δύναμις) of God and the Wisdom of God"; cf. Heb. i. 2, 3, 4, 6, 8; ii. 8. In Heb. ii. 14–18 there is a distinct account of his becoming flesh; cf. verse 7. In Phil. ii. 6–8: "Who (Jesus

[1] .....προστησάμενος τὸν ὀρθὸν αὐτοῦ Λόγον, πρωτόγονον υἱόν, ὃς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς ἱερᾶς ταύτης ἀγέλης οἷά τις μεγάλου βασιλέως ὕπαρχος διαδέξεται. *De Agricult.*, § 12, Mang., i. 308.

[2] *De Confus. ling.*, § 28, Mang., i. 427, cf. § 14. *ib.*, i. 414; cf. *De Migrat. Abrahami*, 1, Mang., i. 437; cf. Heb. i. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 4.

[3] *De Somniis*, i., § 37, Mang., i. 653. [4] *De Cherubim*, § 35, Mang., i. 162.

[5] *De Monarchia*, ii., § 5, Mang., ii. 225.

[6] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 32 (*Apol.*, i. 32).

Christ) being in the form of God, deemed it not grasping to be equal with God (7), But gave himself up, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men," etc. In Rom. viii. 3 we have: "God sending his own Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin," etc. (ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας). It must be borne in mind that the terminology of John i. 14, "and the word became flesh" (σὰρξ ἐγένετο) is different from that of Justin, who uses the word σαρκοποιηθείς. The sense and language here is, therefore, quite as close as that of the fourth Gospel. We have also another parallel in 1 Tim. iii. 16, "Who (God) was manifested in the flesh" (ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί); cf. 1 Cor. xv. 4, 47.

In like manner we find many similar passages in the works of Philo. He says, in one place, that man was not made in the likeness of the most high God the Father of the universe, but in that of the "Second God who is his Word" (ἀλλα πρὸς τὸν δεύτερον θεόν, ὅς ἐστιν ἐκείνου Λόγος).[1] In another place the Logos is said to be the interpreter of the highest God, and he continues: "that must be God of us imperfect beings" (Οὗτος γὰρ ἡμῶν τῶν ἀτελῶν ἂν εἴη θεός).[2] Elsewhere he says: "But the divine Word which is above these (the Winged Cherubim).....but being itself the image of God, at once the most ancient of all conceivable things, and the one placed nearest to the only true and absolute existence without any separation or distance between them";[3] and a few lines further on he explains the cities of refuge to be: "The word of the Governor (of all things) and his creative and kingly power, for of these are the heavens and the whole world."[4] "The Logos of God is above all things in the world, and is the most ancient and the most universal of all things which are."[5] The Word is also the "Ambassador sent by the Governor (of the universe) to his subject (man)" (πρεσβευτὴς δὲ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ὑπήκοον).[6] Such views of the Logos are everywhere met with in the pages of Philo.

Tischendorf continues: "The Word (Logos) of God is his Son."[7] We have already in the preceding paragraphs abundantly illustrated this sentence, and may proceed to the next: "But since they did not know all things concerning the Logos, which is

[1] Philo, *Fragm.*, i., ex. Euseb., *Præpar. Evang.*, vii. 13, Mang., ii. 625; cf. *De Somniis*, i., § 41, Mang., i. 656; *Leg. Alleg.*, ii., § 21, *ib.*, i. 83.

[2] *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., § 73, Mang., i. 128.

[3] *De Profugis*, § 19, Mang., i. 561. [4] *Ib.*, § 19.

[5] Καὶ ὁ Λόγος δὲ τοῦ θεου ὑπεράνω παντός ἐστι του κόσμου, καὶ πρεσβύτατος καὶ γενικώτατος τῶν ὅσα γέγονε. *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., § 61, Mang., i. 121; cf. *De Somniis*, i., § 41, Mang., i. 656.

[6] *Quis rerum div. Heres.*, § 42, Mang., i. 501.

[7] Ὁ Λόγος δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ. (*Apol.*, i. 63).

Christ, they have frequently contradicted each other."[1] These words are used with reference to lawgivers and philosophers. Justin, who frankly admits the delight he took in the writings of Plato[2] and other Greek philosophers, held the view that Socrates and Plato had, in an elementary form, enunciated the doctrine of the Logos,[3] although he contends that they borrowed it from the writings of Moses; and with a largeness of mind very uncommon in the early Church, and, indeed, we might add, in any age, he believed Socrates and such philosophers to have been Christians, even although they had been considered Atheists.[4] As they did not, of course, know Christ to be the Logos, he makes the assertion just quoted. Now, the only point in the passage which requires notice is the identification of the Logos with Jesus, which has already been dealt with, and, as this was asserted in the Apocalypse xix. 13, before the fourth Gospel was written, no evidence in its favour is deducible from the statement. We shall have more to say regarding this presently.

Tischendorf continues: "But in what manner, through the Word of God, Jesus Christ our Saviour has become flesh,"[5] etc.

It must be apparent that the doctrine here is not that of the fourth Gospel which makes "the word become flesh" simply, whilst Justin, representing a less advanced form, and more uncertain stage, of its development, draws a distinction between the Logos and Jesus, and describes Jesus Christ as being made flesh by the power of the Logos. This is no accidental use of words, for he repeatedly states the same fact, as for instance: "But why through the power of the Word, according to the will of God the Father and Lord of all, he was born a man of a Virgin,"[6] etc.

Tischendorf continues: "To these passages out of the short second Apology we extract from the first (cap. 33).[7] By the Spirit, therefore, and power of God (in reference to Luke i. 35: 'The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee') we have nothing else to understand but the Logos, which is the first-born of God."[8]

Here again we have the same difference from the doctrine of the fourth Gospel which we have just pointed out, which is, however,

[1] Ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐ πάντα τὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐγνώρισαν, ὅς ἐστι Χριστὸς, καὶ ἐναντία ἑαυτοῖς πολλάκις εἶπον. *Apol.*, ii. 10.

[2] *Apol.*, ii. 12; cf. *Dial.* 2 f. [3] *Ib.*, i. 60, etc.; cf. 5. [4] *Ib.*, i. 46.

[5] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 32. ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον διὰ Λόγου θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, κ.τ.λ. *Apol.*, i. 66.

[6] *Apol.*, i. 46.

[7] This is an error. Several of the preceding passages are out of the first Apology. No references, however, are given to the source of any of them. We have added them.

[8] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 32 (*Apol.*, i. 33).

completely in agreement with the views of Philo, and characteristic of a less developed form of the idea. We shall further refer to the terminology hereafter, and meantime we proceed to the last illustration given by Tischendorf.

"Out of the Dialogue (c. 105): 'For that he was the only-begotten of the Father of all, in peculiar wise begotten of him as Word and Power (*δύναμις*), and afterwards became man through the Virgin, as we have learnt from the Memoirs, I have already stated."[1]

The allusion here is to the preceding chapters of the Dialogue, wherein, with special reference (c. 100) to the passage which has a parallel in Luke i. 35, quoted by Tischendorf in the preceding illustration, Justin narrates the birth of Jesus.

This reference very appropriately leads us to a more general discussion of the real source of the terminology and Logos doctrine of Justin. We do not propose, in this work, to enter fully into the history of the Logos doctrine, and we must confine ourselves strictly to showing, in the most simple manner possible, that not only is there no evidence whatever that Justin derived his ideas regarding it from the fourth Gospel, but that, on the contrary, his terminology and doctrine may be traced to another source. In the very chapter (100) from which this last illustration is taken, Justin shows clearly whence he derives the expression, "only-begotten. In chap. 97 he refers to the Ps. xxii. (Sept. xxi.) as a prophecy applying to Jesus, quotes the whole Psalm, and comments upon it in the following chapters; refers to Ps. ii. 7: "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," uttered by the voice at the baptism, in ch. 103, in illustration of it; and in ch. 105 he arrives, in his exposition of it, at verse 20: "Deliver my soul from the sword, and my[2] only-begotten (*μονογενῆ*) from the hand of the dog." Then follows the passage we are discussing, in which Justin affirms that he has proved that he was the only-begotten (*μονογενής*) of the Father, and at the close he again quotes the verse as indicative of his sufferings. The Memoirs are referred to in regard to the fulfilment of this prophecy, and his birth as man through the Virgin. The phrase in Justin is quite different from that in the fourth Gospel, i. 14: "And the Word became flesh (*σὰρξ ἐγένετο*) and tabernacled among us, and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only-begotten from the Father" (*ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός*), etc. In Justin, he is "the only-begotten of the Father of all" (*μονογενὴς τῷ Πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων*), and he "became man (*ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος*) through the Virgin," and Justin never once employs the peculiar terminology of the fourth Gospel, *σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, in any part of his writings.

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 32 (*Dial. c. Tryph.*, 105).

[2] This should probably be "thy."

There can be no doubt that, however the Christian doctrine of the Logos may at one period of its development have been influenced by Greek philosophy, it was in its central idea mainly of Jewish origin, and the mere application to an individual of a theory which had long occupied the Hebrew mind. After the original simplicity which represented God as holding personal intercourse with the Patriarchs, and communing face to face with the great leaders of Israel, had been outgrown, an increasing tendency set in to shroud the Divinity in impenetrable mystery, and to regard him as unapproachable and undiscernible by man. This led to the recognition of a Divine representative and substitute of the highest God and Father, who communicated with his creatures, and through whom alone he revealed himself. A new system of interpretation of the ancient traditions of the nation was rendered necessary, and in the Septuagint translation of the Bible we are fortunately able to trace the progress of the theory which culminated in the Christian doctrine of the Logos. Wherever in the sacred records God has been represented as holding intercourse with man, the translators either symbolised the appearance or interposed an angel, who was afterwards understood to be the Divine Word. The first name under which the Divine Mediator was known in the Old Testament was Wisdom (Σοφία), although in its Apocrypha the term Logos was not unknown. The personification of the idea was very rapidly effected, and in the Book of Proverbs, as well as in the later Apocrypha based upon it (the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Sirach, "Ecclesiasticus") we find it in ever-increasing clearness and concretion. In the School of Alexandria the active Jewish intellect eagerly occupied itself with the speculation, and in the writings of Philo especially we find the doctrine of the Logos—the term which by that time had almost entirely supplanted that of Wisdom—elaborated to almost its final point, and wanting little or nothing but its application in an incarnate form to an individual man to represent the doctrine of the earlier Canonical writings of the New Testament, and notably the Epistle to the Hebrews—the work of a Christian Philo[1]—the Pauline Epistles, and lastly the fourth Gospel.

In Proverbs viii. 22 f. we have a representation of Wisdom corresponding closely with the prelude to the fourth Gospel, and still more so with the doctrine enunciated by Justin: "22. The Lord created me the Beginning of his ways for his works. 23.

[1] Ewald freely recognises that the author of this Epistle, written about A.D. 66, transferred Philo's doctrine of the Logos to Christianity. Apollos, whom he considers its probable author, impregnated the Apostle Paul with the doctrine (*Gesch. des. V. Isr.*, vi., p. 474 f., p. 638 f.; *Das Sendschr. an d. Hebräer*, p. 9 f.).

Before the ages he established me, in the beginning before he made the earth. 24. And before he made the abysses, before the springs of the waters issued forth. 25. Before the mountains were settled, and before all the hills he begets me. 26. The Lord made the lands, both those which are uninhabited and the inhabited heights of the earth beneath the sky. 27. When he prepared the heavens I was present with him, and when he set his throne upon the winds, 28, and made strong the high clouds, and the deeps under the heaven made secure, 29, and made strong the foundations of the earth, 30, I was with him adjusting, I was that in which he delighted; daily I rejoiced in his presence at all times."[1] In the *Wisdom of Solomon* we find the writer addressing God: ix. 1....."Who madest all things by thy Word" (*ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν Λόγῳ σου*); and further on in the same chapter, v. 9: "And Wisdom was with thee who knoweth thy works, and was present when thou madest the world, and knew what was acceptable in thy sight, and right in thy commandments." In verse 4 the writer prays: "Give me Wisdom that sitteth by thy thrones" (*Δός μοι τὴν τῶν σῶν θρόνων πάρεδρον σοφίαν*). In a similar way the son of Sirach makes Wisdom say (Eccles. xxiv. 9): "He (the Most High) created me from the beginning before the world, and as long as the world I shall not fail." We have already incidentally seen how these thoughts grew into an elaborate doctrine of the Logos in the works of Philo.

Now Justin, whilst he nowhere adopts the terminology of the fourth Gospel, and nowhere refers to its introductory condensed statement of the Logos doctrine, closely follows Philo and, like him, traces it back to the Old Testament in the most direct way, accounting for the interposition of the divine Mediator in precisely the same manner as Philo, and expressing the views which had led the Seventy to modify the statement of the Hebrew original in their Greek translation. He is, in fact, thoroughly acquainted with the history of the Logos doctrine and its earlier enunciation under the symbol of Wisdom, and his knowledge of it is clearly independent of, and antecedent to, the statements of the fourth Gospel.

Referring to various episodes of the Old Testament in which God is represented as appearing to Moses and the Patriarchs, and in which it is said that "God went up from Abraham,"[2] or "The Lord spake to Moses,"[3] or "The Lord came down to behold the town,"[4] etc., or "God shut Noah into the ark,"[5] and so on, Justin warns his antagonist that he is not to suppose that "the

[1] Prov. viii. 22; *Sept. vers.*
[2] Gen. xviii. 22.
[3] Exod. vi. 29.
[4] Gen. xi. 5.
[5] Gen. vii. 16.

unbegotten God" (ἀγέννητος θεός) did any of these things, for he has neither to come to any place, nor walks, but from his own place, wherever it may be, knows everything, although he has neither eyes nor ears. Therefore he could not talk with anyone, nor be seen by anyone, and none of the Patriarchs saw the Father at all, but they saw "him who was according to his will both his Son (being God) and the Angel, in that he ministered to his purpose, whom also he willed to be born man by the Virgin, who became fire when he spoke with Moses from the bush."[1] He refers throughout his writings to the various appearances of God to the Patriarchs, all of which he ascribes to the pre-existent Jesus, the Word,[2] and in the very next chapter, after alluding to some of these, he says: "He is called Angel because he came to men, since by him the decrees of the Father are announced to men.....At other times he is also called Man and human being, because he appears clothed in these forms as the Father wills, and they call him Logos because he bears the communications of the Father to mankind."[3]

Justin, moreover, repeatedly refers to the fact that he was called Wisdom by Solomon, and quotes the passage we have indicated in Proverbs. In one place he says, in proof of his assertion that the God who appeared to Moses and the Patriarchs was distinguished from the Father, and was in fact the Word (ch. 66-70): "Another testimony I will give you, my friends, I said, from the Scriptures, that God begat before all of the creatures (πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων) a Beginning (ἀρχὴν),[4] a certain rational Power (δύναμιν λογικὴν) out of himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the Glory of the Lord, then the Son, again Wisdom, again Angel, again God, and again Lord and Logos," etc., and a little further on: "The Word of Wisdom will testify to me, who is himself this God begotten of the Father of the universe, being Word, and Wisdom, and Power (δύναμις), and the Glory of the Begetter," etc.,[5] and he quotes, from the Septuagint version, Proverbs viii. 22–36, part of which we have given above. Elsewhere, indeed, (ch. 129), he cites the passage a second time as evidence, with a

[1] *Dial.* 127; cf. 128, 63; cf. Philo, *De Somniis*, i., §§ 11 f., Mang., i. 630 f.; § 31, *ib.*, i. 648; §§ 33 f., *ib.*, i. 649 f.; §§ 39 f, *ib.*, i. 655 f. Nothing, in fact, could show more clearly the indebtedness of Justin to Philo than this argument (*Dial.* 100) regarding the inapplicability of such descriptions to the "unbegotten God." Philo in one treatise, from which we are constantly obliged to take passages as parallels for those of Justin (*de Confusione linguarum*), argues from the very same text: "The Lord went down to see that city and tower," almost in the very same words as Justin, § 27. The passage is unfortunately too long for quotation.

[2] *Dial.* 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 126, 127, 128, etc.; *Apol.*, i. 62, 63; cf. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, §§ 12 f., Mang., i. 91 f.; *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., §§ 25 f., *ib.*, i. 103 f., etc.

[3] *Dial.* 128; cf. *Apol.*, i. 63; *Dial.* 60. [4] Cf. *Apoc.*, iii. 14. [5] *Dial.* 61.

similar context. Justin refers to it again in the next chapter, and the peculiarity of his terminology in all these passages, so markedly different from, and indeed opposed to, that of the fourth Gospel, will naturally strike the reader: "But this offspring (γέννημα) being truly brought forth by the Father was with the Father before all created beings (πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων), and the Father communes with him, as the Logos declared through Solomon, that this same, who is called Wisdom by Solomon, had been begotten of God before all created beings (πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων), both Beginning (ἀρχή) and Offspring (γέννημα)," etc.[1] In another place, after quoting the words, "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, nor the Son but the Father, and they to whom the Son will reveal him," Justin continues: "Therefore he revealed to us all that we have by his grace understood out of the Scriptures, recognising him to be indeed the first-begotten (πρωτότοκος) of God, and before all creatures (πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων)..... and calling him Son, we have understood that he proceeded from the Father by his power and will before all created beings (πρὸ πάντων ποιημάτων), for in one form or another he is spoken of in the writings of the prophets as Wisdom," etc.;[2] and again, in two other places, he refers to the same fact.[3]

On further examination, we find on every side still stronger confirmation of the conclusion that Justin derived his Logos doctrine from the Old Testament and Philo, together with early New Testament writings. We have quoted several passages in which Justin details the various names of the Logos, and we may add one more. Referring to Ps. lxxii., which the Jews apply to Solomon, but which Justin maintains to be applicable to Christ, he says: "For Christ is King, and Priest, and God, and Lord, and Angel, and Man, and Captain, and Stone, and a Son born (παιδίον γεννώμενον), etc., as I prove by all of the Scriptures."[4] Now these representations, which are constantly repeated throughout Justin's writings, are quite opposed to the Spirit of the fourth Gospel; but are, on the other hand, equally common in the works of Philo, and many of them also to be found in the Philonian Epistle to the Hebrews. Taking the chief amongst them, we may briefly illustrate them. The Logos as King, Justin avowedly derives from Ps. lxxii., in which he finds that reference is made to the "Everlasting King, that is to say Christ."[5] We find this representation of the Logos throughout the writings of Philo. In one place already referred to,[6] but which we shall now more fully quote, he says: "For God as Shepherd and King governs according to Law and justice like a flock of sheep, the earth, and water,

[1] *Dial.* 62. [2] *Ib.*, 100. [3] *Ib.*, 126, 129.
[4] *Ib.*, 34. [5] *Ib.*, 34. [6] P. 450 f.

and air, and fire, and all the plants and living things that are in them, whether they be mortal or divine, as well as the course of heaven, and the periods of sun and moon, and the variations and harmonious revolutions of the other stars; having appointed his true Word (*τὸν ὀρθὸν αὐτοῦ Λόγον*) his first begotten Son (*πρωτόγονον υἱόν*) to have the care of this sacred flock as the Vicegerent of a great King";[1] and a little further on he says: "Very reasonably, therefore, he will assume the name of a King, being addressed as a Shepherd."[2] In another place Philo speaks of the "Logos of the Governor, and his creative and kingly power, for of these is the heaven and the whole world."[3]

Then if we take the second epithet, the Logos as Priest (*ἱερεύς*), which is quite foreign to the fourth Gospel, we find it repeated by Justin, as, for instance: "Christ the eternal Priest" (*ἱερεύς*);[4] and it is not only a favourite representation of Philo, but is almost the leading idea of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in connection with the episode of Melchisedec, in whom also both Philo[5] and Justin[6] recognise the Logos. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, vii. 3, speaking of Melchisedec: "but likened to the Son of God, abideth a Priest for ever"; again in iv. 14: "Seeing then that we have a great High Priest that is passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God," etc.; ix. 11: "Christ having appeared a High Priest of the good things to come"; xii. 21: "Thou art a Priest for ever." The passages are far too numerous to quote.[7] They are equally numerous in the writings of Philo. In one place already quoted[8] he says: "For there are, as it seems, two temples of God, one of which is this world, in which the High Priest is the Divine Word, his first-begotten Son" (*Δύο γὰρ, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἱερὰ θεοῦ, ἓν μὲν ὅδε ὁ κόσμος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἀρχιερεύς, ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος Λόγος*).[9] Elsewhere, speaking of the period for the return of fugitives, the death of the high priest, which taken literally would embarrass him in his allegory, Philo says: "For we maintain the High Priest not to be a man, but the divine Word, who is without participation not only in voluntary but also in involuntary sins";[10] and he goes on to speak of this priest as "the most sacred Word" (*ὁ ἱερώτατος*

[1] *De Agricult.*, § 12, Mang., i. 308.

[2] *Εἰκότως τοίνυν ὁ μὲν βασιλέως ὄνομα ὑποδύσεται, ποιμὴν προσαγορευθείς, κ.τ.λ.* § 14, cf. *De Profugis*, § 20, Mang., i. 562; *De Somniis*, ii., § 37, Mang., i. 691.

[3] *De Profugis*, § 19, Mang., i. 561; cf. *de Migrat Abrahami*, § 1, Mang., i. 437.

[4] *Dial.* 42.

[5] *Legis Alleg.*, § 26, Mang., i. 104, etc.

[6] *Dial.* 34, 83, etc.

[7] Heb. vii. 11, 15, 17, 21 f., 26 f.; viii. 1 f.; ii. 6, 17; v. 5, 6, 10.

[8] P. 450.

[9] Philo, *De Somniis*, i., § 37, Mang., i. 653.

[10] *De Profugis*, § 20, Mang., i. 562. Philo continues: that this priest, the Logos, must be pure, "God indeed being his Father, who is also the Father of all things, and Wisdom his mother, by whom the universe came into being."

Λόγος).[1] Indeed, in many long passages he descants upon the "high priest Word" (ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς Λόγος).[2]

Proceeding to the next representations of the Logos as "God and Lord," we meet with the idea everywhere. In Hebrews i. 8: "But regarding the Son he saith: Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever" (*πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱὸν Ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ Θεὸς, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος*), etc.; and again in the Epistle to the Philippians, ii. 6: "Who (Jesus Christ), being in the form of God, deemed it not grasping to be equal with God" (*ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ*), etc.[3] Philo, in the fragment preserved by Eusebius, to which we have already referred,[4] calls the Logos the "Second God" (*δεύτερος θεός*).[5] In another passage he has: "But he calls the most ancient God his present Logos," etc. (*καλεῖ δὲ θεὸν τὸν πρεσβύτατον αὐτοῦ νυνὶ Λόγον*);[6] and a little further on, speaking of the inability of men to look on the Father himself: "Thus they regard the image of God, his Angel Word, as himself" (*οὕτως καὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰκόνα, τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ Λόγον, ὡς αὐτὸν κατανοοῦντιν*).[7] Elsewhere discussing the possibility of God's swearing by himself, which he applies to the Logos, he says: "For in regard to us imperfect beings he will be a God, but in regard to wise and perfect beings the first. And yet Moses, in awe of the superiority of the unbegotten (*ἀγεννήτου*) God, says: 'And thou shalt swear by his name,' not by himself; for it is sufficient for the creature to receive assurance and testimony by the divine Word."[8]

It must be remarked, however, that both Justin and Philo place the Logos in a position more clearly secondary to God the Father than the prelude to the fourth Gospel i. 1. Both Justin and Philo apply the term *θεός* to the Logos without the article. Justin distinctly says that Christians worship Jesus Christ as the Son of the true God, holding him in the second place (*ἐν δευτέρᾳ χώρᾳ ἔχοντες*);[9] and this secondary position is systematically defined through Justin's writings in a very decided way, as it is in the works of Philo by the contrast of the begotten Logos with the unbegotten God. Justin speaks of the Word as "the first-born of the unbegotten God" (*πρωτότοκος τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ θεῷ*),[10] and the distinctive appellation of the "unbegotten God" applied to the Father is most common throughout his writings.[11] We may, in

[1] *De Profugis*, § 21. [2] *De Migrat. Abrahami*, § 18, Mang., i. 452.
[3] Cf. verse 11. [4] P. 451.
[5] *Fragm.*, i., Mang., ii. 625; cf. *Leg. Alleg.*, ii., § 21, Mang., i. 83.
[6] Philo, *De Somniis*, i. 39, Mang., i. 655.
[7] *Ib.*, i., § 41, Mang., i. 656. [8] *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., § 73, Mang., i. 128.
[9] *Apol.*, i. 13, cf. 60, where he shows that Plato gives the second place to the Logos.
[10] *Ib.*, i. 53. [11] *Ib.*, i. 49; *ib.*, ii. 6, 13; *Dial.* 126, 127.

continuation of this remark, point out another phrase of Justin which is continually repeated, but is thoroughly opposed both to the spirit and to the terminology of the fourth Gospel, and which likewise indicates the secondary consideration in which he held the Logos. He calls the Word constantly "the first-born of all created beings" (*πρωτότοκος τῶν πάντων ποιημάτων*,[1] or *πρωτότοκος πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων*,[2] or *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*),[3] "the first-born of all creation," echoing the expression of Col. i. 15—(The Son) "who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation" (*πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*). This is a totally different view from that of the fourth Gospel, which in so emphatic a manner enunciates the doctrine: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God"—a statement which Justin, with Philo, only makes in a very modified sense.

To return, however, the next representation of the Logos by Justin is as "Angel." This perpetually recurs in his writings.[4] In one place, to which we have already referred, he says: "The Word of God is his Son, as we have already stated, and he is also called Angel ("Αγγελος, or Messenger) and Apostle, for he brings the message of all we need to know, and is sent an Apostle to declare all the message contains."[5] In the same chapter reference is again made to passages quoted for the sake of proving "that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and Apostle, being aforetime the Word, and having appeared now in the form of fire and now in the likeness of incorporeal beings";[6] and he gives many illustrations.[7] The passages in which the Logos is called Angel are too numerous to be more fully dealt with here. It is scarcely necessary to point out that this representation of the Logos as Angel is not only foreign to, but opposed to the spirit of, the fourth Gospel, although it is thoroughly in harmony with the writings of Philo. Before illustrating this we may incidentally remark that the ascription to the Logos of the name "Apostle" which occurs in the two passages just quoted above, as well as in other parts of the writings of Justin,[8] is likewise opposed to the fourth Gospel, although it is found in earlier writings, exhibiting a less developed form of the Logos doctrine; for the Epistle to the Hebrews, iii. 1, has: "Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, Jesus," etc. (*κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν*). We are, in fact, constantly directed by the remarks of Justin to other

[1] *Dial.* 62, 84, 100, etc. [2] *Ib.*, 61, 100, 125, 129, etc. [3] *Ib.*, 85, 138, etc.
[4] *Apol.*, i. 63; *Dial.* 34, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 127; cf. *Apol.*, i. 6.
[5] *Apol.*, i. 63. [6] *Ib.*, i. 63.
[7] Cf. *Dial.* 56–60, 127, 128. [8] *Apol.*, i. 12, etc.

sources of the Logos doctrine, and never to the fourth Gospel, with which his tone and terminology do not agree. Everywhere in the writings of Philo we meet with the Logos as Angel. He speaks "of the Angel Word of God" in a sentence already quoted,[1] and elsewhere in a passage, one of many others, upon which the lines of Justin which we are now considering (as well as several similar passages)[2] are in all probability moulded. Philo calls upon men to "strive earnestly to be fashioned according to God's first-begotten Word, the eldest Angel, who is the Archangel bearing many names, for he is called the Beginning (ἀρχή), and Name of God, and Logos, and the Man according to his image, and the Seer of Israel."[3] Elsewhere, in a remarkable passage, he says: "To his Archangel and eldest Word, the Father, who created the universe, gave the supreme gift that having stood on the confine he may separate the creature from the Creator. The same is an intercessor on behalf of the ever-wasting mortal to the immortal; he is also the ambassador of the Ruler to his subjects. And he rejoices in the gift, and the majesty of it he describes, saying: 'And I stood in the midst between the Lord and you' (Numbers xvi. 48); being neither unbegotten like God, nor begotten like you, but between the two extremes," etc.[4] We have been tempted to give more of this passage than is necessary for our immediate purpose, because it affords the reader another glimpse of Philo's doctrine of the Logos, and generally illustrates its position in connection with the Christian doctrine.

The last of Justin's names which we shall here notice is the

[1] Philo, *De Somniis*, i., § 41, Mang., i. 656. See p. 456 f.

[2] For instance, in the quotations at p. 456 f. from *Dial.* 61, and also that from *Dial.* 62, in which the Logos is also called the Beginning (ἀρχή). Both Philo and Justin, no doubt, had in mind Prov. viii. 22. In *Dial.* 100, for example, there is a passage, part of which we have quoted, which reads as follows: "For in one form or another he is spoken of in the writings of the prophets as Wisdom, and the Day, and the East, and a Sword, and a Stone, and a Rod, and Jacob, and Israel," etc. Now, in the writings of Philo these passages in the Old Testament are discussed and applied to the Logos, and to one in particular we may refer as an illustration. Philo says: "I have also heard of a certain associate of Moses having pronounced the following saying: 'Behold a man whose name is the East' (Zech. vi. 12). A most novel designation if you consider it to be spoken regarding one composed of body and soul; but if regarding that incorporeal Being who does not differ from the divine image, you will agree that the name of the East is perfectly appropriate to him. For indeed the Father of the Universe caused this eldest son (πρεσβύτατον υἱὸν) to rise (ἀνέτειλε), whom elsewhere he names his first-begotten (πρωτόγονον)," etc. (*De Confus. Ling.*, § 14). Can it be doubted that Justin follows Philo in such exegesis?

[3] *De Confus. Ling.*, § 28; Mang., i. 427; cf. *De Migrat. Abrahami*, § 31, Mang., i. 463.

[4] *Quis rerum div. Heres.*, § 42, Mang., i. 501 f.

Logos as "Man" as well as God. In another place Justin explains that he is sometimes called a Man and human being, because he appears in these forms as the Father wills.[1] But here confining ourselves merely to the concrete idea, we find a striking representation of it in 1 Tim. ii. 5: "For there is one God and one mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus" (εἷς γὰρ θεός, εἷς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς); and again in Rom. v. 15: ".....by the grace of the one man Jesus Christ" (τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), as well as elsewhere.[2] We have already seen in the passage quoted above from *De Confus. Ling.*, § 28, that Philo mentions, among the many names of the Logos, that of "the man according to (God's) image" (ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος,[3] or "the typical man"). If we pass to the application of the Logos doctrine to Jesus, we have the strongest reason for inferring Justin's total independence of the fourth Gospel. We have frequently pointed out that the title of Logos is given to Jesus in New Testament writings earlier than the fourth Gospel. We have remarked that, although the passages are innumerable in which Justin speaks of the Word having become man through the Virgin, he never makes use of the peculiar expression of the fourth Gospel, "the Word became flesh" (ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο). On the few occasions on which he speaks of the Word having been *made flesh*, he uses the term σαρκοποιηθείς.[4] In one instance he has σάρκα ἔχειν,[5] and, speaking of the Eucharist, Justin once explains that it is the memory of Christ's having made himself *body*, σωματοποιήσασθαι.[6] Justin's most common phrase, however—and he repeats it in numberless instances—is that the Logos submitted to be born, and become man (γεννηθῆναι ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον ὑπέμεινεν), by a Virgin, or he uses variously the expressions: ἄνθρωπος γέγονε, ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος, γενέσθαι ἄνθρωπον.[7] In several places he speaks of him as the first production or offspring (γέννημα) of God before all created beings, as, for instance: "The Logos.....who is the first offspring of God" (ὅ ἐστι πρῶτον γέννημα τοῦ θεοῦ);[8] and again, "and that this offspring was begotten of the Father absolutely before all creatures the Word was declaring" (καὶ ὅτι γεγεννῆσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦτο τὸ γέννημα πρὸ πάντων ἁπλῶς τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ λόγος ἐδήλου).[9]

[1] *Dial.* 128. See the quotation p. 456 f. [2] Phil., ii. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 47.
[3] Elsewhere Philo says that the Word was the archetypal model after which man and the human mind were formed. *De Exsecrat.*, § 8, Mang., i. 436; *De Mundi Opificio*, § 6, Mang., i. 6.
[4] *Apol.*, i. 66 (twice); *Dial.* 45, 100. [5] *Dial.* 48. [6] *Ib.*, 70.
[7] *Apol.*, i. 5, 23, 63; *Apol.*, ii. 6, 13; *Dial.* 34, 45, 48, 57, 63, 75, 84, 85, 105, 113, 125, 127, etc.
[8] *Apol.*, i. 21. [9] *Dial.* 129, cf. 62.

We need not say more of the expressions: "first-born" (πρωτότοκος), "first-begotten" (πρωτόγονος), so constantly applied to the Logos by Justin, in agreement with Philo; nor to "only begotten" (μονογενής), directly derived from Ps. xxii. 20 (Ps. xxi. 20, *Sept.*).

It must be apparent to everyone who seriously examines the subject that Justin's terminology is markedly different from, and in spirit sometimes opposed to, that of the fourth Gospel, and in fact that the peculiarities of the Gospel are not found in Justin's writings at all.[1] On the other hand, his doctrine of the Logos is precisely that of Philo,[2] and of writings long antecedent to the fourth Gospel; and there can be no doubt, we think, that it was derived from them.

We may now proceed to consider other passages adduced by Tischendorf to support his assertion that Justin made use of the fourth Gospel. He says: "There are not lacking some passages of the Johannine Gospel to which passages in Justin can be traced. In the *Dialogue*, ch. 88, he writes of John the Baptist: 'The people believed that he was the Christ, but he cried to them: I am not the Christ, but the voice of a preacher.' This is connected with John i. 20 and 23; for no other Evangelist has reported the first words in the Baptist's reply."[3] Now, the passage in Justin, with its context, reads as follows: "For John sat by the Jordan (καθεζομένου ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου) and preached the Baptism of repentance, wearing only a leathern girdle and raiment of camel's hair, and eating nothing but locust and wild honey; men supposed (ὑπελάμβανον) him to be the Christ, wherefore he himself cried to them: "I am not the Christ, but the voice of one crying: For he shall come (ἥξει) who is stronger than I, whose shoes I am not meet (ἱκανός) to bear.'"[4] The

[1] A passage is sometimes quoted in which Justin reproaches the Jews for spreading injurious and unjust reports "concerning the only blameless and righteous Light sent by God to man" (*Dial.* 17), and this is claimed as an echo of the Gospel; cf. John i. 9, viii. 12, xii. 46, etc. Now, here again we have in Philo the elaborate representation of the Logos as the sun and Light of the world; as, for instance, in a long passage in the treatise *De Somniis*, i., § 13 f., Mang., i. 631 f., of which we can only give the slightest quotation. Philo argues that Moses only speaks of the sun by symbols, and that it is easy to prove this; "since in the first place God is Light. 'For the Lord is my Light and my Saviour,' it is said in hymns, and not only Light, but archetype of every other light — nay, rather more ancient and more perfect than archetype, having the Logos for an examplar. For indeed the examplar was his most perfect Logos, Light," etc. (*De Somniis*, i., § 13, Mang., i. 632). And again: "But according to the third meaning he calls the divine Word the sun," and proceeds to show how by this sun all wickedness is brought to light, and the sins done secretly and in darkness are made manifest (*De Somniis*, i., § 15, Mang., i. 634; cf. *ib.*, § 19).

[2] If the *Cohort. ad Graecos* be assigned to Justin, it directly refers to Philo's works, c. ix. [3] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 23. [4] *Dial.* 88.

only ground upon which this passage can be compared with the fourth Gospel is the reply: "I am not the Christ" (*οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός*), which in John i. 20 reads: *ὅτι ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός*; and it is perfectly clear that, if the direct negation occurred in any other Gospel, the difference of the whole passage in the *Dialogue* would prevent even an apologist from advancing any claim to its dependence on that Gospel. In order to appreciate the nature of the two passages, it may be well to collect the nearest parallels in the Gospels, and compare them with Justin's narrative:—

Justin, Dial. 88.	John i. 19–27.
Men (*οἱ ἄνθρωποι*) supposed him to be the Christ;	19. And this is the testimony of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him: Who art thou? 24. And they were sent by the Pharisees.
wherefore he cried to them: I am not the Christ (*οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός*),	20. And he confessed, and denied not: and confessed[2] that: I am not the Christ (*ὅτι ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός*). 21. And they asked again: Who then? Art thou, Elias? etc. 22. .....Who art thou? etc.
but the voice of one crying:	23. He said: I am the voice of one crying in the desert: Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Isaiah. 25. .....Why baptisest thou? etc. 26. John answered them, saying: I baptise with water, but in the midst of you standeth one whom ye know not.
For he shall come (*ἥξει*) who is stronger than I (*ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου*), whose shoes I am not meet (*ἱκανὸς*) to bear.[1]	27. Who cometh after me (*ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος*), who is become before me (*ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν*),[3] the thong of whose shoes I am not worthy (*ἄξιος*) to unloose.

The introductory description of John's dress and habits is quite contrary to the fourth Gospel, but corresponds to some extent with Matt. iii. 4. It is difficult to conceive two accounts more fundamentally different, and the discrepancy becomes more apparent when we consider the scene and actors in the episode. In Justin,

[1] Matt. iii. 11 reads: "but he that cometh after me is stronger than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear" (*ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστίν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι*). The context is quite different. Luke iii. 16 more closely resembles the version of the fourth Gospel in this part with the context of the first Synoptic.

[2] The second *καὶ ὡμολόγησεν* is omitted by the *Cod. Sin.*

[3] The *Cod. Sinaiticus*, as well as most other important MSS., omits this phrase.

it is evident that the hearers of John had received the impression that he was the Christ, and the Baptist, becoming aware of it, voluntarily disabused their minds of this idea. In the fourth Gospel the words of John are extracted from him ("he confessed and denied not") by emissaries sent by the Pharisees of Jerusalem specially to question him on the subject. The account of Justin betrays no knowledge of any such interrogation. The utter difference is brought to a climax by the concluding statement of the fourth Gospel :—

JUSTIN.	JOHN i. 28.
For John sat by the Jordan and preached the Baptism of repentance, wearing, etc.	These things were done in Bethany beyond the river Jordan, where John was baptising.

In fact, the scene in the two narratives is as little the same as their details. One can scarcely avoid the conclusion, in reading the fourth Gospel, that it quotes some other account and does not pretend to report the scene direct. For instance, i. 15: "John beareth witness of him, and cried, saying, 'This was he *of whom I said:* He that cometh after me is become before me, because he was before me,'" etc. V. 19: "And this is the testimony of John, *when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou?* and he confessed and denied not, and confessed that I am not the Christ," etc. Now, as usual, the Gospel which Justin uses more nearly approximates to our first Synoptic than the other Gospels, although it differs in very important points from that also; still, taken in connection with the third Synoptic and Acts xiii. 25, this indicates the great probability of the existence of other writings combining the particulars as they occur in Justin. Luke iii. 15 reads: "And as the people were in expectation, and all mused in their hearts concerning John whether he were the Christ, 16. John answered, saying to them all: I indeed baptise you with water, but he that is stronger than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: he shall baptise you with the Holy Spirit and with fire," etc.

Whilst with the sole exception of the simple statement of the Baptist that he was not the Christ, which in all the accounts is clearly involved in the rest of the reply, there is no analogy between the parallel in the fourth Gospel and the passage in Justin, many important circumstances render it certain that Justin did not derive his narrative from that source. We have already[1] fully discussed the peculiarities of Justin's account of the Baptist, and in the context to the very passage before us there are details quite foreign to our Gospels which show that Justin made use of another and different work. When Jesus stepped into the

[1] P. 199 f.

water to be baptised a fire was kindled in the Jordan, and the voice from heaven makes use of words not found in our Gospels; but both the incident and the words are known to have been contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews and other works. Justin likewise states, in immediate continuation of the passage before us, that Jesus was considered the son of Joseph the carpenter, and himself was a carpenter and accustomed to make ploughs and yokes.[1] The Evangelical work of which Justin made use was obviously different from our Gospels, therefore, and the evident conclusion to which any impartial mind must arrive is, that there is not the slightest ground for affirming that Justin quoted the passage before us from the fourth Gospel, from which he so fundamentally differs, but every reason, on the contrary, to believe that he derived it from a Gospel different from ours.

The next argument advanced by Tischendorf is, that on two occasions he speaks of the restoration of sight to persons born blind,[2] the only instance of which in our Gospels is that recorded, John ix. 1. The references in Justin are very vague and general. In the first place he is speaking of the analogies in the life of Jesus with events believed in connection with mythological deities, and he says that he would appear to relate acts very similar to those attributed to Æsculapius when he says that Jesus "healed the lame and paralytic, and the maimed from birth (ἐκ γενετῆς πονηρούς), and raised the dead."[3] In the *Dialogue*, again referring to Æsculapius, he says that Christ "healed those who were from birth and according to the flesh blind (τοὺς ἐκ γενετῆς καὶ κατὰ τὴν σάρκα πηρούς), and deaf, and lame."[4] In the fourth Gospel the born-blind is described as (ix. 1) ἄνθρωπος τυφλὸς ἐκ γενετῆς. There is a variation, it will be observed, in the term employed by Justin, and that such a remark should be seized upon as an argument for the use of the fourth Gospel serves to show the poverty of the evidence for the existence of that work. Without seeking any further, we might at once reply that such general references as those of Justin might well be referred to the common tradition of the Church, which certainly ascribed all kinds of marvellous cures and miracles to Jesus. It is, moreover, unreasonable to suppose that the only Gospel in which the cure of one born blind was narrated was that which is the fourth in our Canon. Such a miracle may have formed part of a dozen similar collections extant at the time of Justin, and in no case could such an allusion be recognised as evidence of the use of the

[1] *Dial.* 88.

[2] *Apol.*, i. 22; *Dial.* 69. On the second occasion Justin seems to apply the "from their birth" not only to the blind, but to the lame and deaf.

[3] *Apol.*, i. 22.

[4] *Dial.* 69.

fourth Gospel. But in the *Dialogue*, along with this remark, Justin couples the statement, that although the people saw such cures "they asserted them to be magical illusion; for they also ventured to call him a magician and deceiver of the people."[1] This is not found in our Gospels, but traces of the same tradition are met with elsewhere, as we have already mentioned;[2] and it is probable that Justin either found all these particulars in the Gospel of which he made use, or that he refers to traditions familiar to the early Christians.

Tischendorf's next point is that Justin quotes the words of Zechariah xii. 10, with the same variation from the text of the Septuagint as John xix. 37—"They shall look on him whom they pierced" (ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν[3] instead of ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς μέ, ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο), arising out of an emendation of the translation of the Hebrew original. Tischendorf says: "Nothing can be more opposed to probability than the supposition that John and Justin have here, independently of each other, followed a translation of the Hebrew text which elsewhere has remained unknown to us."[4] The fact is, however, that the translation which has been followed is not elsewhere unknown. We meet with the same variation, much earlier, in the only book of the New Testament which Justin mentions, and with which, therefore, he was beyond any doubt well acquainted—Rev. i. 7: "Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him (ὄψεται αὐτόν), and they which pierced (ἐξεκέντησαν) him, and all the tribes of the earth shall bewail him. Yea, Amen." This is a direct reference to the passage in Zech. xii. 10. It will be remembered that the quotation in the Gospel, "They shall look upon him whom they pierced," is made solely in reference to the thrust of the lance in the side of Jesus, while that of the Apocalypse is a connection of the prophecy with the second coming of Christ, which, except in a spiritual sense, is opposed to the fourth Gospel. Justin upon each occasion quotes the whole passage also in reference to the second coming of Christ as the Apocalypse does, and this alone settles the point so far as these two sources are concerned. If Justin derived his variation from either of the canonical works, therefore, we should be bound to conclude that it must have been from the Apocalypse. The correction of

[1] .....φαντασίαν μαγικὴν γίνεσθαι ἔλεγον. Καὶ γὰρ μάγον εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐτόλμων λέγειν καὶ λαοπλάνον. *Dial.* 69.

[2] P. 204 f.

[3] Justin has, *Apol.*, i. 52, ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν. *Dial.* 14, καὶ ὄψεται ὁ λαὸς ὑμῶν καὶ γνωσεῖ εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν, and, *Dial.* 32, speaking of the two comings of Christ; the first, in which he was pierced (ἐξεκεντήθη), "and the second in which ye shall know whom ye have pierced"; δευτέραν δὲ ὅτε ἐπιγνώσεσθε εἰς ὃν ἐξεκεντήσατε.

[4] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 34.

the Septuagint version, which has thus been traced back as far as A.D. 68, when the Apocalypse was composed, was noticed by Jerome in his Commentary on the text;[1] and Aquila, a contemporary of Irenæus, and later Symmachus and Theodotion, as well as others, similarly adopted ἐξεκέντησαν. Ten important MSS., of the Septuagint, at least, have the reading of Justin and of the Apocalypse, and these MSS. likewise frequently agree with the other peculiarities of Justin's text. In all probability, as Credner, who long ago pointed out all these circumstances, conjectured, an emendation of the rendering of the LXX. had early been made, partly in Christian interest and partly for the critical improvement of the text,[2] and this amended version was used by Justin and earlier Christian writers. Ewald[3] and some others suggest that probably ἐκκεντεῖν originally stood in the Septuagint text. Every consideration is opposed to the dependence of Justin upon the fourth Gospel for the variation.

The next and last point advanced by Tischendorf is a passage in *Apol.*, i. 61, which is compared with John iii. 3–5, and in order to show the exact character of the two passages we shall place them in parallel columns :—

Justin, Apol., i. 61.	John iii. 3–5.
For the Christ also said :	
Unless ye be born again (ἀναγεννηθῆτε) ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.	3. Jesus answered and said unto him : Verily, verily, I say unto thee : Except a man be born from above (γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν) he cannot see the kingdom of God.
Now that it is impossible for those who have once been born to go (ἐμβῆναι) into the matrices of the parents[4] (εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν) is evident to all.	4. Nicodemus saith unto him : How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter (εἰσελθεῖν) a second time into his mother's womb (εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ) and be born?
	5. Jesus answered : Verily, verily, I say unto thee : Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into[5] the kingdom of God.[6]
Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν· Ἂν μὴ	3. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις

[1] "*Quod ibi* (1 *Regg.* ii. 18) *errore interpretationis accidit, etiam hic factum deprehendimus. Si enim legatur* Dacaru, ἐξεκέντησαν, *i.e., compunxerunt sive confixerunt accipitur : sin autem contrario ordine, literis commutatis* Racadu, ὤρχήσαντο, *i.e., saltaverunt intelligitur et ob similitudinem literarum error est natus.*"

[2] Credner, *Beiträge*, ii., p. 293 f. Cf. Sanday, *Gospels in Sec. Cent.*, p. 281.

[3] *Comm. in Apoc. Joh.*, 1829, p. 93, anm. 1 ; cf. *Die Joh. Schriften*, 1862, p. 112, anm. 1 ; Lücke, *Offenb. Joh.*, ii., p. 446 f.

[4] Τεκοῦσα, a mother, instead of *μήτηρ*.

[5] The *Cod. Sinaiticus* reads : "he cannot see."

[6] The *Cod. Sinaiticus* has been altered here to : "of heaven."

Justin, Apol., i. 61.	John iii. 3–5.
ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι, φανερὸν πᾶσίν ἐστι.	γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. 4. Λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Νικόδημος· Πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος γεννηθῆναι γέρων ὤν; μὴ δύναται εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ δεύτερον εἰσελθεῖν καὶ γεννηθῆναι; 5. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς[1] τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.[2]

This is the most important passage by which apologists endeavour to establish the use of the fourth Gospel by Justin, and it is that upon which the whole claim may be said to rest. We shall be able to appreciate the nature of the case by the weakness of its strongest evidence. The first point which must have struck any attentive reader is the singular difference of the language of Justin, and the absence of the characteristic peculiarities of the Johannine Gospel. The double "verily, verily," which occurs twice even in these three verses, and constantly throughout the Gospel,[3] is absent in Justin; and apart from the total difference of the form in which the whole passage is given (the episode of Nicodemus being entirely ignored), and omitting minor differences, the following linguistic variations occur:

Justin has:

ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε	instead of	ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν
οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς	,,	οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν[4]
βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν	,,	βασιλεία τοῦ θεου
ἀδύνατον	,,	μὴ δύναται
τὰς μήτρας	,,	τὴν κοιλίαν
τῶν τεκουσῶν	,,	τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ
ἐμβῆναι	,,	εἰσελθεῖν
τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους	,,	ἄνθρωπος γεννηθῆναι γέρων ὤν.

It is almost impossible to imagine a more complete difference, both in form and language, and it seems to us that there does not exist a single linguistic trace by which the passage in Justin can be connected with the fourth Gospel. The fact that Justin knows nothing of the expression γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν ("born from above"), upon which the whole statement in the fourth Gospel

[1] The *Cod. Sinaiticus* reads ἰδεῖν for εἰσελθεῖν εἰς here.

[2] The *Cod. Sin.* has τῶν οὐρανῶν, but τοῦ θεοῦ is substituted by a later hand. The former reading is only supported by a very few obscure and unimportant codices. The *Codices Alex.* (A) and *Vatic.* (B), as well as all the most ancient MSS., read τοῦ θεοῦ.

[3] Cf. i. 51; iii. 11; v. 19, 24, 25; vi. 26, 32, 47, 53; viii. 34, 51, 58; x. 1, 7; xii. 24; xiii. 16, 20, 21, 38; xiv. 12; xvi. 20, 23; xxi. 18, etc.

[4] It is very forced to jump to the end of the fifth verse to get εἰσελθεῖν εἰς, and even in that case the *Cod. Sinaiticus* reads again, precisely as in the third, ἰδεῖν.

turns, but uses a totally different word, *ἀναγεννηθῆτε* (born again), is of great significance. Tischendorf wishes to translate *ἄνωθεν* "anew" (or again), as the version of Luther and the authorised English translation read, and thus render the *ἀναγεννηθῆναι* of Justin a fair equivalent for it; but even this would not alter the fact that so little does Justin quote the fourth Gospel that he has not even the test word of the passage. The word *ἄνωθεν*, however, certainly cannot here be taken to signify anything but "from above"[1]—from God, from heaven—and this is not only its natural meaning, but the term is several times used in other parts of the fourth Gospel, always with this same sense,[2] and there is nothing which warrants a different interpretation here. On the contrary, the same signification is manifestly indicated by the context, and forms the point of the whole lesson.

"Except a man be born of water and *of Spirit*[3] he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. 6. That which hath been born of the flesh is flesh, and that which hath been born of the Spirit is Spirit. 7. Marvel not that I said unto thee: ye must be born from above" (*γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν*). The explanation of *ἄνωθεν* is given in verse 6. The birth "of the Spirit" is the birth "from above," which is essential to entrance into the kingdom of God.[4]

The sense of the passage in Justin is different and much more simple. He is speaking of regeneration through baptism, and the manner in which converts are consecrated to God when they are made new (*καινοποιηθέντες*) through Christ. After they are taught to fast and pray for the remission of their sins, he says: "They are then taken by us where there is water, that they may be regenerated ('born again,' *ἀναγεννῶνται*), by the same manner of regeneration ('being born again,' *ἀναγεννήσεως*) by which we also were regenerated ('born again,' *ἀναγεννήθημεν*). For in the name of the Father of the Universe the Lord God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then make the washing with the water. For the Christ also said, 'Unless ye be born again (*ἀναγεννηθῆτε*), ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.'

[1] Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 253; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, ii., p. 375; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 214; Lange, *Ev. n. Joh.*, 1862, p. 84 f.; Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebr. et Talm. on John*, iii. 3; *Works*, xii., p. 254 f.; J. B. Lightfoot, *A Fresh Revision of the New Test.*, 1871, p. 142; Lücke, *Comment. Ev. Joh.*, i., p. 516 f.; Meyer, *Ev. Joh.*, 1869, p. 154 f.; Reuss, *Hist. Théol. Chrét.*, ii., p. 521 f., 523, *n.* 2; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 36; *Het Ev. n. Joh.*, 1865, pp. 21, 105, 237, 272, 387; Späth, *Protestanten Bibel*, 1874, p. 276 f.; Stemler, *Het Ev. v. Joh.*, 1868, pp. 250, 338, 344, 400; Suicer, *Thesaurus s. v. ἄνωθεν*; de Wette, *Ev. u. Br. Joh.*, 1863, pp. 61; Wordsworth, *Gk. Test., The Four Gospels*, p. 280; Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1855, p. 140. Cf. Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, p. 193.

[2] Cf. i. 31; xix. 11, 23.

[3] Cf. Ezekiel xxxvi. 25–27.

[4] Cf. Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebr. et Talm.; Works*, xii., p. 256.

Now that it is impossible for those who have once been born to go into the matrices of the parents is evident to all." And then he quotes Isaiah i. 16–20, "Wash you, make you clean," etc., and proceeds: "And regarding this (Baptism) we have been taught this reason. Since at our first birth we were born without our knowledge, and perforce, etc., and brought up in evil habits and wicked ways, therefore in order that we should not continue children of necessity and ignorance, but become children of election and knowledge, and obtain in the water remission of sins which we had previously committed, the name of the Father of the Universe and Lord God is pronounced over him who desires to be born again (*ἀναγεννηθῆναι*), and has repented of his sins," etc.[1] It is clear that, whereas Justin speaks simply of regeneration by baptism, the fourth Gospel indicates a later development of the doctrine by spiritualising the idea, and requiring not only regeneration through the water ("Except a man be born of water"), but that a man should be born from above ("and of the Spirit"), not merely *ἀναγεννηθῆναι*, but *ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι*. The word used by Justin is that which was commonly employed in the Church for regeneration, and other instances of it occur in the New Testament.[2]

The idea of regeneration, or being born again, as essential to conversion, was quite familiar to the Jews themselves, and Lightfoot gives instances of this from Talmudic writings: "If any one become a proselyte he is like a child 'new born.' The Gentile that is made a proselyte and the servant that is made free he is like a child new born."[3] This is, of course, based upon the belief in special privileges granted to the Jews, and the Gentile convert admitted to a share in the benefits of the Messiah became a Jew by spiritual new birth. Justin, in giving the words of Jesus, clearly professed to make an exact quotation[4]: "For Christ also said: Unless ye be born again," etc. It must be remembered, however, that Justin is addressing the Roman emperors, who would not understand the expression that it was necessary to be "born again" in order to enter the kingdom of heaven. He therefore explains that he does not mean a physical new birth by men already born; and this explanation may be regarded as natural, under the circumstances, and independent of any written source. In any case, the striking difference of his language from that of the fourth Gospel at least forbids the inference that it must necessarily have been derived from that Gospel. To argue otherwise would be to assume that sayings of Jesus which are maintained to be historical were not recorded in

[1] *Apol.*, i. 61.
[2] Cf. 1 Peter i. 3, 28.
[3] Lightfoot, *Works*, xii., p. 255 f.
[4] Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, p. 193.

more than four Gospels, and indeed in this instance were limited to one. This is not only in itself inadmissible, but historically untrue,[1] and a moment of consideration must convince every impartial mind that it cannot legitimately be asserted that an express quotation of a supposed historical saying must have been taken from a parallel in one of our Gospels, from which it differs so materially in language and circumstance, simply because that Gospel happens to be the only one now surviving which contains particulars somewhat similar. The express quotation fundamentally differs from the fourth Gospel, and the natural explanation of Justin which follows is not a quotation at all, and likewise fundamentally differs from the Johannine parallel. Justin not only ignores the peculiar episode in the fourth Gospel in which the passage occurs, but neither here nor anywhere throughout his writings makes any mention of Nicodemus. The accident of survival is almost the only justification of the affirmation that the fourth Gospel is the source of Justin's quotation. On the other hand, we have many strong indications of another source. In our first Synoptic (xviii. 3) we find traces of another version of the saying of Jesus, much more nearly corresponding with the quotation of Justin: "And he said, verily I say unto you: Except ye be turned and become as the little children ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."[2] The last phrase of this saying is literally the same as the quotation of Justin, and gives his expression, "kingdom of heaven," so characteristic of his Gospel, and so foreign to the Johannine. We meet with a similar quotation in connection with baptism, still more closely agreeing with Justin, in the *Clementine Homilies*, xi. 26: "Verily I say unto you: Except ye be born again (ἀναγεννηθῆτε) by living water in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."[3] Here, again, we have both the ἀναγεννηθῆτε and the βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, as well as the reference only to water in the baptism, and this is strong confirmation of the existence of a version of the passage, different from the Johannine, from which Justin quotes. As both the author of the *Clementines* and Justin probably made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, some most competent critics have, with reason, adopted the conclusion that the passage we are discussing

[1] Cf. Luke i. 1.

[2] καὶ εἶπεν, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία, οὐ μη εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Matt. xviii. 3.

[3] *Hom.*, xi. 26; cf. *Recogn.*, vi. 9: "*Amen dico vobis, nisi quis denuo renatus fuerit ex aqua, non introibit in regna cælorum.*" Cf. *Clem. Hom. Epitome*, § 18. In this much later compilation the passage, altered and manipulated, is of no interest. Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien u. Recogn.*, 1854, p. 43 f.; Schliemann, *Die Clementinen*, 1844, p. 334 f.

was probably derived from that Gospel; at any rate, it cannot be maintained as a quotation from our fourth Gospel, and it is, therefore, of no value as evidence even for its existence. Were it successfully traced to that work, however, the passage would throw no light on the authorship and character of the fourth Gospel.

If we turn for a moment from this last of the points of evidence adduced by Tischendorf for the use of the fourth Gospel by Justin, to consider how far the circumstances of the history of Jesus narrated by Justin bear upon this quotation, we have a striking confirmation of the results we have otherwise attained. Not only is there a total absence from his writings of the peculiar terminology and characteristic expressions of the fourth Gospel, but there is no allusion made to any of the occurrences exclusively narrated by that Gospel, although many of these, and many parts of the Johannine discourses of Jesus, would have been peculiarly suitable for his purpose. We have already pointed out the remarkable absence of any use of the expressions by which the Logos doctrine is stated in the prologue. We may now add that Justin makes no reference to any of the special miracles of the fourth Gospel. He is apparently quite ignorant even of the raising of Lazarus. On the other hand, he gives representations of the birth, life, and death of Jesus, which are ignored by the Johannine Gospel, and are opposed to its whole conception of Jesus as the Logos; and when he refers to circumstances which are also narrated in that Gospel, his account is different from that which it gives. Justin perpetually speaks of the birth of Jesus by the Virgin of the race of David and the Patriarchs: his Logos thus becomes man[1] (not "*flesh*" -ἄνθρωπος, not σάρξ); he is born in a cave in Bethlehem;[2] he grows in stature and intellect by the use of ordinary means like other men; he is accounted the son of Joseph the carpenter and Mary: he himself works as a carpenter, and makes ploughs and yokes.[3] When Jesus is baptised by John, a fire is kindled in Jordan; and Justin evidently knows nothing of John's express declaration in the fourth Gospel, that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God.[4] Justin refers to the change of name of Simon in connection with his recognition of the Master as "Christ the Son of God,"[5] which is narrated quite differently in the fourth Gospel (i. 40-42), where such a declaration is put into the mouth of Nathaniel (i. 49), which Justin ignores. Justin does not mention Nicodemus either in connection with the statement regarding the necessity of being "born from above," or with the entombment (xix. 39). He has the prayer and agony in the garden,[6] which the fourth Gospel

[1] *Dial.* 100, etc. [2] *Ib.*, 78. [3] *Ib.*, 88.
[4] *Ib.*, 88. [5] *Ib.*, 100. [6] *Ib.*, 99, 103.

excludes, as well as the cries on the cross which that Gospel does not contain. Then, according to Justin, the last supper takes place on the 14th Nisan,[1] whilst the fourth Gospel, ignoring the Passover and last supper, represents the last meal as eaten on the 13th Nisan (John xiii. 1 f., cf. xviii. 28). He likewise contradicts the fourth Gospel in limiting the work of Jesus to one year. In fact, it is impossible for writings, so full of quotations of the words of Jesus and of allusions to the events of his life, more completely to ignore or vary from the fourth Gospel throughout; and if it could be shown that Justin was acquainted with such a work, it would follow certainly that he did not consider it an Apostolical or authoritative composition.

We may add that, as Justin so distinctly and directly refers to the Apostle John as the author of the Apocalypse,[2] there is confirmation of the conclusion, otherwise arrived at, that he did not, and could not, know the Gospel and also ascribe it to him. Finally, the description which Justin gives of the manner of teaching of Jesus excludes the idea that he knew the fourth Gospel: "Brief and concise were the sentences uttered by him; for he was no Sophist, but his word was the power of God."[3] No one could for a moment assert that this description applies to the long and artificial discourses of the fourth Gospel, whilst, on the other hand, it eminently describes the style of teaching in the Synoptics, with which the numerous Gospels in circulation amongst early Christians were, of course, more nearly allied.

The inevitable conclusion at which we must arrive is that, far from indicating any acquaintance with the fourth Gospel, the writings of Justin not only do not furnish the slightest evidence of its existence, but offer presumptive testimony against its Apostolical origin.

Tischendorf only devotes a short note to Hegesippus,[4] and does not pretend to find in the fragments of his writings preserved to us by Eusebius, or the details of his life which he has recorded, any evidence for our Gospels. Apologists generally admit that this source, at least, is barren of all testimony for the fourth Gospel, but Dr. Westcott cannot renounce so important a witness without an effort, and he therefore boldly says: "When he (Hegesippus) speaks of 'the door of Jesus' in his account of the death of St. James, there can be little doubt that he alludes to the language of our Lord recorded by St. John."[5] The passage to

[1] "And it is written that on the day of the Passover you seized him, and likewise during the Passover you crucified him" (*Dial.* 111; cf. *Dial.* 70; Matt. xxvi. 2, 17 f., 30, 57).

[2] *Dial.* 81.

[3] *Apol.*, i. 14.

[4] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 19, anm. 1.

[5] *On the Canon*, p. 182 f.

which Dr. Westcott refers, but which he does not quote, is as follows:—"Certain, therefore, of the seven heretical parties amongst the people, already described by me in the Memoirs, inquired of him, what was the door of Jesus; and he declared this (τοῦτον—Jesus) to be the Saviour. From which some believed that Jesus is the Christ. But the aforementioned heretics did not believe either a resurrection, or that he shall come to render to every one according to his works. As many as believed, however, did so through James." The rulers, fearing that the people would cause a tumult from considering Jesus to be the Messiah (Χριστός), entreat James to persuade them concerning Jesus, and prevent their being deceived by him; and in order that he may be heard by the multitude, they place James upon a wing of the temple, and cry to him: "O, just man, whom we all are bound to believe, inasmuch as the people are led astray after Jesus, the crucified, declare plainly to us what is the door of Jesus."[1] To find in this a reference to the fourth Gospel requires a good deal of apologetic ingenuity. It is perfectly clear that, as an allusion to John x. 7, 9, "I am the door," the question, "What is the door of Jesus?" is mere nonsense, and the reply of James totally irrelevant. Such a question in reference to the discourse in the fourth Gospel, moreover, in the mouths of the antagonistic Scribes and Pharisees, is quite inconceivable, and it is unreasonable to suppose that it has any connection with it. Various emendations of the text have been proposed to obviate the difficulty of the question, but none of these have been adopted, and it has now been generally accepted that θύρα is used in an idiomatic sense. The word is very frequently employed in such a manner, or symbolically, in the New Testament,[2] and by the Fathers. The Jews were well acquainted with a similar use of the word in the Old Testament, in some of the Messianic Psalms, as for instance: Ps. cxviii. 19, 20 (cxvii. 19, 20, *Sept.*). 19, "Open to me the gates (πύλας) of righteousness; entering into them, I will give praise to the Lord"; 20, "This is the gate (ἡ πύλη) of the Lord; the righteous shall enter into it."[3] Quoting this passage, Clement of Alexandria remarks: "But explaining the saying of the prophet, Barnabas adds: Many gates (πυλῶν) being open, that which is in righteousness is in Christ, in which all those who enter are blessed."[4] Grabe explains the passage of Hegesippus by a refer-

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii. 23.

[2] Cf. Acts xiv. 27; 1 Cor. xvi. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 12; Col. iv. 3; James v. 9; Rev. iii. 8, 20; iv. 1.

[3] Cf. Ps. xxiv. 7–8 (xxiii. 7–8, *Sept.*).

[4] *Strom.* vi. 8, § 64. This passage is not to be found in the Epistle of Barnabas.

ence to the frequent allusions in Scripture to the two ways: one of light, the other of darkness; the one leading to life, the other to death; as well as the simile of two gates which is coupled with them, as in Matt. vii. 13 f. He, therefore, explains the question of the rulers, "What is the door of Jesus?" as an inquiry into the judgment of James concerning him: whether he was a teacher of truth or a deceiver of the people; whether belief in him was the way and gate of life and salvation, or of death and perdition.[1] He refers as an illustration to the Epistle of Barnabas, xviii.: "There are two ways of teaching and of power: one of light, the other of darkness. But there is a great difference between the two ways." The Epistle, under the symbol of the two ways, classifies the whole of the moral law.[2] In the *Clementine Homilies*, xviii. 17, there is a version of the saying, Matt. vii. 13 f., derived from another source, in which "way" is more decidedly even than in our first Synoptic made the equivalent of "gate": "Enter ye through the narrow and straitened way (ὁδός) through which we shall enter into life." Eusebius himself, who has preserved the fragment, evidently understood it distinctly in the same sense, and he gives its true meaning in another of his works, where he paraphrases the question into an inquiry, as to the opinion which James held concerning Jesus (*τίνα περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἔχοι δόξαν*).[3] This view is supported by many learned men, and Routh has pointed out that Ernesti considered he would have been right in making διδαχή, doctrine, teaching, the equivalent of *θύρα*, although he admits that Eusebius never uses it in his history in connection with Christian doctrine.[4] He might, however, have instanced this passage, in which it is clearly used in this sense, and so explained by Eusebius. There is evidently no intention on the part of the Scribes and Pharisees to ridicule, in asking, "What is the door of Jesus?" but they desire James to declare plainly to the people the teaching of Jesus, and his personal pretension. To suppose that the rulers of the Jews set James upon a wing of the temple, in order that they might ask him a question, for the benefit of the

[1] *Spicil. Patr., ii.*, p. 254.

[2] In like manner the *Clementine Homilies* give a peculiar version of Deut. xxx. 15: "Behold I have set before thy face the way of life, and the way of death" (*Hom.*, xviii. 17, cf. vii. 7). We have already shown (p. 150 f.) that *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (i.–vi.) is based upon this text.

[3] *Demonstrat. Evang.*, iii. 7; Routh, *Rel. Sacr.*, i., p. 235.

[4] "*Si ego in Glossis ponerem: θύρα, διδαχή, rectum esset. Sed respicerem ad loca Græcorum theologorum v. c. Eusebii in Hist. Eccl. ubi non semel θύρα Χριστοῦ (sic) de doctrina Christiano dicitur.*" *Dissert. De Usu Glossariorum.* Routh, *Reliq. Sacræ.*, *i.*, p. 236. Donaldson gives as the most probable meaning: "To what is it that Jesus is to lead us? And James' answer is therefore: 'To salvation'" (*Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 190, note).

multitude, based upon a discourse in the fourth Gospel, unknown to the Synoptics, and even in relation to which such an inquiry as, "What is the door of Jesus?" becomes mere ironical nonsense, surpasses all that we could have imagined even of apologetic zeal.

We have already said all that is necessary with regard to Hegesippus, in connection with the Synoptics, and need not add more here. It is certain that had he written anything interesting about our Gospels, and, we may say, particularly about the fourth, the fact would have been recorded by Eusebius.[1]

Nor need we add much to our remarks regarding Papias of Hierapolis.[2] It is perfectly clear that the works of Matthew and Mark,[3] regarding which he records such important particulars, are not the Gospels in our Canon, which pass under their names; he does not seem to have known anything of the third Synoptic; and there is no reason to suppose that he referred to the fourth Gospel or made use of it. He is, therefore, at least, a total blank so far as the Johannine Gospel and our third Synoptic are concerned, but he is more than this, and it may, we think, be concluded that Papias was not acquainted with any such Gospels which he regarded as Apostolic compositions, or authoritative documents. Had he said anything regarding the composition or authorship of the fourth Gospel, Eusebius would certainly have mentioned the fact; and this silence of Papias is strong presumptive evidence against the Johannine Gospel. Tischendorf's argument in regard to the Phrygian Bishop is mainly directed to this point, and he maintains that the silence of Eusebius does not make Papias a witness against the fourth Gospel, and does not involve the conclusion that he did not know it, inasmuch as it was not, he affirms, the purpose of Eusebius to record the mention or use of the books of the New Testament which were not disputed.[4] It might be contended that this reasoning is opposed to the practice and express declaration of Eusebius himself, who says: "But in the course of the history I shall, with the successions (from the Apostles), carefully intimate what ecclesiastical writers of the various periods made use of the *Antilegomena* (or disputed writings), and which of them, and what has been stated by these as well regarding the collected (ἐνδιαθήκοι) and *Homologoumena*

[1] See remarks regarding the Silence of Eusebius; Preface to Complete ed., p. xviii. f.

[2] P. 276 f.; Preface to Complete ed., p. xxi. f.

[3] It is evident that Papias did not regard the works by "Matthew" and "Mark" which he mentions, as of any authority. Indeed, all that he reports regarding the latter is merely apologetic, and in deprecation of criticism.

[4] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 112 f.

(or accepted writings), as regarding those which are not of this kind."[1] It is not worth while, however, to dwell upon this here. The argument in the case of Papias stands upon a broader basis. It is admitted that Eusebius engages carefully to record what ecclesiastical writers state regarding the *Homologoumena*, and that he actually does so. Now Papias has himself expressed the high value he attached to tradition, and his eagerness in seeking information from the Presbyters. The statements regarding the Gospels composed by Matthew and Mark, quoted by Eusebius, are illustrative at once both of the information collected by Papias and of that cited by Eusebius. How comes it, then, that nothing whatever is said about the fourth Gospel, a work so peculiar and of such exceptional importance, said to be composed by the Apostle whom Jesus loved? Is it possible to suppose that, when Papias collected from the Presbyter the facts which he has recorded concerning Matthew and Mark, he would not also have inquired about a Gospel by John, had he known of it? Is it possible that he could have had nothing interesting to tell about a work presenting so many striking and distinctive features? Had he collected any information on the subject, he would certainly have recorded it, and as certainly Eusebius would have quoted what he said,[2] as he did the account of the other two Gospels, for he even mentions that Papias made use of the 1st Epistle of John and 1st Epistle of Peter, two equally accepted writings. The legitimate presumption, therefore, is that, as Eusebius did not mention the fact, he did not find anything regarding the fourth Gospel in the work of Papias, and that Papias was not acquainted with it. This presumption is confirmed by the circumstance that when Eusebius writes, elsewhere (*H. E.*, iii. 24), of the order of the Gospels, and the composition of John's Gospel, he has no greater authority to give for his account than vague tradition: "they say" (*φασί*).

Proceeding from this merely negative argument, Tischendorf endeavours to show that not only is Papias not a witness against the fourth Gospel, but that he presents evidence in its favour. The first reason he advances is that Eusebius states: "The same (Papias) made use of testimonies out of the first Epistle of John, and likewise out of that of Peter."[3] On the supposed identity of the authorship of the Epistle and Gospel, Tischendorf, as in the case of Polycarp, claims this as evidence for the fourth Gospel. Eusebius, however, does not quote the passages upon which he bases this statement, and, knowing his inaccuracy and the hasty and uncritical manner in which he and the Fathers generally jump

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 3; cf. iii. 24.
[2] Cf. Preface to 6th ed., p. xi. f., xxi. f.
[3] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39.

at such conclusions, we must reject this as sufficient proof that Papias really did use the Epistle, and that Eusebius did not adopt his opinion from a mere superficial analogy of passages; but, if it were certain that Papias actually quoted from the Epistle, it does not in the least follow that he ascribed it to the Apostle John, and the use of the Epistle would scarcely affect the question as to the character and authorship of the fourth Gospel.

The next testimony advanced by Tischendorf is, indeed, of an extraordinary character. There is a Latin MS. (*Vat. Alex.* 14) in the Vatican, which Tischendorf assigns to the ninth century, in which there is a preface, by an unknown hand, to the Gospel according to John, which commences as follows: "*Evangelium iohannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab iohanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut papias nomine hierapolitanus discipulus iohannis carus in exotericis id est in extremis quinque libris retulit*" ("The Gospel of John was published and given to the churches by John whilst he was still in the flesh, as Papias, named of Hierapolis, an esteemed disciple of John, related in his *Exoterics*, that is his last five books"). Tischendorf says: "There can, therefore, be no more decided declaration made of the testimony of Papias for the Johannine Gospel."[1] He wishes to end the quotation here, and only refers to the continuation, which he is obliged to admit to be untenable, in a note. The passage proceeds: "*Disscripsit vero evangelium dictante iohanne recte*" ("He [Papias] indeed wrote out the Gospel, John duly dictating"); then follows another passage regarding Marcion, representing him also as a contemporary of John, which Tischendorf likewise confesses to be untrue.[2] Now, Tischendorf admits that the writer desires it to be understood that he derived the information that Papias wrote the fourth Gospel at the dictation of John likewise from the work of Papias, and, as it is perfectly impossible, by his own admissions, that Papias, who was not a contemporary of the Apostle, could have stated this, the whole passage is clearly fabulous and written by a person who never saw the book at all. This extraordinary piece of evidence is so obviously absurd that it is passed over in silence by other critics, even of the strongest apologetic tendency, and it stands here a pitiable instance of the arguments to which destitute criticism can be reduced.

In order to do full justice to the last of the arguments of Tischendorf, we shall give it in his own words: "Before we leave Papias, we have still to consider one testimony for the Gospel of John which Irenæus, v. 36, § 2, quotes out of the very mouth of the Presbyters, those high authorities of Papias: 'And therefore, say they, the Lord declared: In my Father's house are many

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 119. [2] *Ib.*, p. 119, anm. 1.

mansions' (John xiv. 2). As the Presbyters set this declaration in connection with the blessedness of the righteous in the City of God, in Paradise, in Heaven, according as they bear fruit thirty, sixty, or one hundred-fold, nothing is more probable than that Irenæus takes this whole declaration of the Presbyters, which he gives, §§ 1–2, like the preceding description of the thousand years' reign, from the work of Papias. But whether this be its origin or not, the authority of the Presbyters is in any case higher than that of Papias," etc.[1] Now in the quotation from Irenæus given in this passage Tischendorf renders the oblique construction of the text by inserting "say they," referring to the Presbyters of Papias; and, as he does not give the original, he should at least have indicated that these words are supplementary. We shall endeavour as briefly as possible to state the facts of the case.

Irenæus, with many quotations from Scripture, is arguing that our bodies are preserved, and that the Saints who have suffered so much in the flesh shall in that flesh receive the fruits of their labours. In v. 33, § 2, he refers to the saying given in Matt. xix. 29 (Luke xviii. 29, 30), that whosoever has left lands, etc., because of Christ shall receive a hundred-fold in this world, and in the next, eternal life; and then, enlarging on the abundance of the blessings in the Millennial kingdom, he affirms that Creation will be renovated, and the earth acquire wonderful fertility: and he adds, § 3, "As the Presbyters who saw John, the disciple of the Lord, remember that they heard from him, how the Lord taught concerning those times and said," etc. ("*Quemadmodum presbyteri meminerunt, qui Joannem discipulum Domini viderunt audisse se ab eo, quemadmodum de temporibus illis docebat Dominus, et dicebat,*" etc.); and then he quotes the passage, "The days will come in which vines will grow each having ten thousand Branches," etc.; and "In like manner that a grain of wheat would produce ten thousand ears," etc. With regard to these, he says, at the beginning of the next paragraph, v. 33, § 4: "These things are testified in writing by Papias, a hearer of John and associate of Polycarp, an ancient man in the fourth of his books: for there were five books composed by him.[2] And he added, saying: 'But these things are credible to believers. And Judas the traitor not believing, and asking how shall such growths be effected by the Lord, the Lord said: They who shall come to them shall see.' Prophesying of these times, therefore, Isaiah says: 'The Wolf also shall feed with the Lamb,' etc. (quoting Isaiah xi. 6–9); and

[1] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 119 f.

[2] Eusebius has preserved the Greek of this passage (*H. E.*, iii. 39), and goes on to contradict the statement of Irenæus that Papias was a hearer and contemporary of the Apostles. Eusebius states that Papias, in his preface, by no means asserts that he was.

again he says, recapitulating: 'Wolves and lambs shall then feed together,'" etc. (quoting Isaiah lxv. 25), and so on, continuing his argument. It is clear that Irenæus introduces the quotation from Papias, and, ending his reference at "They who shall come to them shall see," he continues, with a quotation from Isaiah, his own train of reasoning. We give this passage to show the manner in which Irenæus proceeds. He then continues with the same subject, quoting (v. 34, 35) Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Daniel, the Apocalypse, and sayings found in the New Testament bearing upon the Millennium. In c. 35 he argues that the prophecies he quotes of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Apocalypse must not be allegorised away, but that they literally describe the blessings to be enjoyed after the coming of Antichrist and the resurrection in the New Jerusalem on earth; and he quotes Isaiah vi. 12, lx. 5, 21, and a long passage from Baruch iv. 36, v. 9 (which he ascribes to Jeremiah), Isaiah xlix. 16, Galatians iv. 26, Rev. xxi. 2, xx. 2-15, xxi. 1-6, all descriptive, as he maintains, of the Millennial kingdom prepared for the saints; and then, in v. 36, the last chapter of his work on heresies, as if resuming his previous argument, he proceeds[1]: "§ 1. And that these things shall ever remain without end Isaiah says: 'For like as the new heaven and the new earth which I make remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name continue,'[2] and, as the Presbyters say, then those who have been deemed worthy of living in heaven shall go thither, and others shall enjoy the delights of Paradise, and others shall possess the glory of the City; for everywhere the Saviour shall be seen as those who see him shall be worthy. § 2. But that there is this distinction of dwelling (*εἶναι δὲ τὴν διαιτολὴν ταύτην τῆς οἰκήσεως*) of those bearing fruit the hundred-fold, and of the (bearers) of the sixty-fold, and of the (bearers of) the thirty-fold: of whom some indeed shall be taken up into the heavens, some shall live in Paradise, and some shall inhabit the City, and that for this reason (*διὰ τοῦτο—propter hoc*) the Lord declared: In the.....(plural) of my Father are many mansions (*ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου μονὰς εἶναι πολλάς*).[3] For all

[1] We have the following passage only in the old Latin version, with fragments of the Greek preserved by Andrew of Cæsarea in his *Comment. in Apoc.*, xviii., lxiv., and elsewhere.

[2] Isaiah lxvi. 22, *Sept.*

[3] With this may be compared John xiv. 2, *ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου μοναὶ πολλαί εἰσιν*. If the passage be maintained to be from the Presbyters, the variations from the text of the Gospel are important. Doubtless the expression, *τὰ τοῦ πατρός μου*, may mean "my father's house," and this sense is ancient, but a wider sense is far from excluded, and the plural is used. In Luke ii. 49 the very phrase occurs, *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου*, and in the authorised version is translated "about my father's business" (cf. 1 Tim. iv. 15). The best commentators are divided in opinion regarding the passage in Luke. It is

things are of God, who prepares for all the fitting habitation, as his Word says that distribution is made to all by the Father according as each is or shall be worthy. And this is the couch upon which they recline who are invited to banquet at the Wedding. The Presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles, state that this is the order and arrangement of those who are saved, and that by such steps they advance,"[1] etc.

It is impossible for any one who attentively considers the whole of this passage, and who makes himself acquainted with the manner in which Irenæus conducts his argument, and interweaves it with quotations, to assert that the phrase we are considering must have been taken from a book referred to three chapters earlier, and was not introduced by Irenæus from some other source. In the passage from the commencement of the second paragraph Irenæus enlarges upon, and illustrates, what "the Presbyters say" regarding the blessedness of the saints, by quoting the view held as to the distinction between those bearing fruit thirty-fold, sixty-fold, and one hundred-fold,[2] and the interpretation given of the saying regarding "many mansions"; but the source of his quotation is quite indefinite, and may simply be the exegesis of his own day. That this is probably the case is shown by the continuation: "And this is the Couch upon which they recline who are invited to banquet at the Wedding"—an allusion to the marriage supper upon which Irenæus had previously discoursed;[3] immediately after which phrase, introduced by Irenæus himself, he says: "The Presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles, state that this is the order and arrangement of those who are saved," etc. Now, if the preceding passages had been a mere quotation from the Presbyters of Papias, such a remark would have been out of place and useless; but, being the exposition of the prevailing views, Irenæus confirms it and prepares to wind up the whole subject by the general statement that the Presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles, affirm that this is the order and arrangement of those who are saved, and that by such steps they advance and ascend through the Spirit to the Son, and through the Son to the Father, etc.; and a few sentences after he closes his work.

In no case can it be legitimately affirmed that the citation of "the Presbyters," and the "Presbyters, disciples of the Apostles," is a reference to the work of Papias. When quoting

necessary, in a case like the present, to convey the distinct difference between the words as they stand in Irenæus and the saying in the fourth Gospel. Dr. Sanday has "In my Father's realm" (*Gospels in Sec. Cent.*, p. 297).

[1] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, v. 36, §§ 1, 2.

[2] Matt. xiii. 8; Mark iv. 20; cf. Matt. xxv. 14–29; Luke xix. 12–26; xii. 47, 48.

[3] *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 36, §§ 5, 6.

"the Presbyters who saw John, the disciple of the Lord," three chapters before, Irenæus distinctly states that Papias testifies what he quotes in writing in the fourth of his books; but there is nothing to indicate that "the Presbyters" and "the Presbyters, disciples of the Apostles," subsequently referred to, after a complete change of context, have anything to do with Papias. The references to Presbyters in this work of Irenæus are very numerous, and when we remember the importance which the Bishop of Lyons attached to "that tradition which comes from the Apostles, which is preserved in the Churches by a succession of Presbyters,"[1] the reference before us assumes a very different complexion. In one place, Irenæus quotes "the divine Presbyter" (ὁ θεῖος πρεσβύτης), "the God-loving Presbyter" (ὁ θεοφιλὴς πρεσβύτης),[2] who wrote verses against the heretic Marcus. Elsewhere he supports his extraordinary statement that the public career of Jesus, instead of being limited to a single year, extended over a period of twenty years, and that he was nearly fifty when he suffered,[3] by the appeal: "As the gospel and all the Presbyters testify, who in Asia met with John the disciple of the Lord (stating) that these things were transmitted to them by John. For he continued among them till the times of Trajan."[4] That these Presbyters are not quoted from Papias may be inferred from the fact that Eusebius, who had his work, cites the passage from Irenæus without allusion to Papias; and as he adduces two witnesses only, Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria, to prove the assertion regarding John, he would certainly have referred to the earlier authority, had the work of Papias contained the statement, as he does for the stories regarding the daughters of the Apostle Philip, the miracle in favour of Justus, and other matters.[5] We need not refer to Clement, nor to Polycarp, who had been "taught by Apostles," and the latter of whom Irenæus knew in his youth.[6] Irenæus in one place also gives a long account of the teaching of some one upon the sins of David and other men of old, which he introduces: "As I have heard from a certain Presbyter, who had heard it from those who had seen the Apostles, and from those

[1] *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 2, § 2; cf. i. 10, § 1; 27, §§ 1, 2; ii. 22, § 5; iii. *præf.* 3, § 4; 21, § 3; iv. 27, § 1; 32, § 1; v. 20, § 2; 30, § 1.

[2] *Ib.*, i. 15, § 6.

[3] *Ib.*, ii. 22, §§ 4, 6.

[4] *Adv. Hær.*, ii. 22, § 5; cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 23. "In Asia" evidently refers chiefly to Ephesus, as is shown by the passage quoted immediately after by Eusebius from *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 4, "the Church in Ephesus also..... where John continued until the times of Trajan, is a witness to the truth of the apostolic tradition."

[5] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39.

[6] *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, §§ 3, 4. Fragment from his Epistle to Florinus preserved by Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 20.

who learnt from them,"[1] etc. Further on, speaking evidently of a different person, he says: "In this manner also a Presbyter disciple of the Apostles reasoned regarding the two Testaments";[2] and quotes fully. In another place Irenæus, after quoting Gen. ii. 8, "And God planted a Paradise eastward in Eden," etc., states: "Wherefore the Presbyters, who are disciples of the Apostles (οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, τῶν ἀποστόλων μαθηταί) say that those who were translated had been translated thither," there to remain, till the consummation of all things, awaiting immortality; and Irenæus explains that it was into this Paradise that Paul was caught up (2 Cor. xii. 4).[3] It seems highly probable that these "Presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles," who are quoted on Paradise, are the same "Presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles," referred to here on the same subject (v. 36, §§ 1, 2); but there is nothing to connect them with Papias. He also speaks of the Septuagint translation of the Bible as the version of the "Presbyters,"[4] and on several occasions he calls Luke "the follower and disciple of the Apostles" *(Sectator et discipulus apostolorum)*,[5] and characterises Mark as "the interpreter and follower of Peter" *(interpres et sectator Petri)*,[6] and refers to both as having learnt from the words of the Apostles.[7] Here is, therefore, a wide choice of Presbyters, including even Evangelists, to whom the reference of Irenæus may with equal right be ascribed,[8] so that it is unreasonable to claim it as an allusion to the work of Papias.[9] In fact, Dr. Tischendorf and Dr. Westcott[10] stand almost alone in advancing this passage as evidence

[1] *Quemadmodum audivi a quodam presbytero, qui audierat ab his qui apostolos viderant, et ab his qui didicerant*, etc. (*Adv. Hær.*, iv. 27, § 1; cf. § 2; 30, § 1). This has been variously conjectured to be a reference to Polycarp, Papias, and Pothinus, his predecessor at Lyons; but it is admitted by all to be impossible to decide upon the point.

[2] *Hujusmodi quoque de duobus testamentis senior apostolorum discipulus disputabat*, etc. (*Adv. Hær.*, iv. 32, § 1).

[3] *Adv. Hær.*, v. 5, § 1. [4] *Ib.*, iii. 21, §§ 3, 4.

[5] *Ib.*, i. 23, § 1; iii. 10, § 1; 14, § 1. [6] *Ib.*, iii. 10, § 6. [7] *Ib.*, iii. 15, § 4.

[8] In the New Testament the term Presbyter is even used in reference to Patriarchs and Prophets (Heb. xi. 2; cf. Matt. xv. 2, Mark vii. 3, 5).

[9] With regard to the Presbyters quoted by Irenæus generally. Cf. Routh, *Reliq. Sacræ*, i., p. 47 f.

[10] Dr. Westcott affirms: "In addition to the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, Papias appears to have been acquainted with the Gospel of St. John."(3) He says no more, and offers no evidence for this assertion in the text. There are two notes, however, on the same page, which we shall now quote, the second being that to which (3) above refers. "[2] No conclusion can be drawn from Eusebius' silence as to express testimonies of Papias to the Gospel of St. John, as we are ignorant of his special plan, and the title of his book shows that it was not intended to include 'all the oracles of the Lord' (see p. 61, note 2)." The second note is: "[3] There is also (!?) an allusion to it in the quotation from the 'Elders' found in Irenæus (lib. v.

that either Papias or his Presbyters were acquainted with the fourth Gospel; and this renders the statement which is made by them without any discussion all the more indefensible. Scarcely a single writer, however apologetic, seriously cites it amongst the external testimonies for the early existence of the Gospel, and the few who do refer to the passage merely mention, in order to abandon, it. So far as the question as to whether the fourth Gospel was mentioned in the work of Papias is concerned, the passage has practically never entered into the controversy at all, the great mass of critics having recognised that it is of no evidential value, and, by common consent, tacitly excluded it. It is admitted that the Bishop of Hierapolis cannot be shown to have known the fourth Gospel, and the majority affirm that he actually was not acquainted with it. Being, therefore, so completely detached from Papias, it is obvious that the passage does not in any way assist the fourth Gospel, but becomes assignable to vague tradition, and subject to the cumulative force of objections, which prohibit an early date being ascribed to so indefinite a reference.

Before passing on there is one other point to mention: Andrew of Cæsarea, in the preface to his *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, mentions that Papias maintained "the credibility" (τὸ ἀξιόπιστον) of that book, or, in other words, its apostolic origin.[1] His strong millenarian opinions would naturally make such a composition stand high in his esteem, if indeed it did not materially contribute to the formation of his views, which is still more probable. Apologists admit the genuineness of this statement; nay, claim it as undoubted evidence of the acquaintance of Papias with the

ad. f.) which probably was taken from Papias (fr. v. *Routh et Nott.*). The Latin passage containing a reference to the Gospel which is published as a fragment of 'Papias' by Grabe and Routh (fr. xi.) is taken from the 'Dictionary' of a mediæval Papias quoted by Grabe upon the passage, and not from the present Papias. The 'Dictionary' exists in MS. both at Oxford and Cambridge. I am indebted to the kindness of a friend for this explanation of what seemed to be a strange forgery" (*On the Canon*, p. 65). The note 2, p. 61, referred to in note 2 quoted above, says on this subject: "The passage quoted by Irenæus from 'the Elders' may probably be taken as a specimen of his style of interpretation" (!), and then follows a quotation, "as the Presbyters say," down "to many mansions." Dr. Westcott then continues: "Indeed, from the similar mode of introducing the story of the vine which is afterwards referred to Papias, it is reasonable to conjecture that this interpretation is one from Papias' *Exposition*." We have given the whole of the passages to show how little evidence there is for the statement which is made. The isolated assertion in the text, which is all that most readers would see, is supported by no better testimony than that in the preceding note inserted at the foot of an earlier page.

[1] Andreas, *Proleg. in Apocalypsin*; Routh, *Rel. Sacræ*, i., p. 15.

Apocalypse.[1] Dr. Westcott, for instance, says: "He maintained, moreover, 'the divine inspiration' of the Apocalypse, and commented, at least, upon part of it."[2] He must, therefore, have recognised the book as the work of the Apostle John, and we shall, hereafter, show that it is impossible that the author of the Apocalypse was the author of the Gospel; therefore, in this way also, Papias is a witness against the Apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel.

We must now turn to the *Clementine Homilies*, although, as we have shown,[3] the uncertainty as to the date of this spurious work, and the late period which must undoubtedly be assigned to its composition, render its evidence of very little value for the canonical Gospels. The passages pointed out in the Homilies as indicating acquaintance with the fourth Gospel were long advanced with hesitation, and were generally felt to be inconclusive; but on the discovery of the concluding portion of the work, and its publication by Dressel in 1853, it was found to contain a passage which apologists now claim as decisive evidence of the use of the Gospel, and which even succeeded in converting some independent critics.[4] Tischendorf[5] and Dr. Westcott,[6] in the few lines devoted to the *Clementines*, do not refer to the earlier proof passages, but rely entirely upon that last discovered. With a view, however, to making the whole of the evidence clear, we shall give all of the supposed allusions to the fourth Gospel, confronting them with the text. The first is as follows :—

Hom. III. 52.	John X. 9.
Wherefore he, being the true prophet, said :	
I am the gate of life: he coming in through me cometh in unto life, as there is no other teaching which is able to save.	I am the door (of the sheepfold); if anyone enter through me he shall be saved, and shall go in and shall go out and shall find pasture.
Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς ἀληθὴς ὢν προφήτης ἔλεγεν· 'Εγώ εἰμι ἡ πύλη τῆς ζωῆς· ὁ δι' ἐμοῦ εἰσερχόμενος εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὴν ζωήν ὡς οὐκ οὔσης ἑτέρας τῆς σώζειν δυναμένης διδασκαλίας.	'Εγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα· δι' ἐμοῦ ἐάν τις εἰσέλθῃ, σωθήσεται, καὶ εἰσελεύσεται καὶ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ νομὴν εὑρήσει.

[1] Lücke, *Einl. Offenb. Joh.*, 1852, ii., p. 526; Ewald, *Die Joh. Schriften*, ii., p. 371 f.; Guericke, *Gesammtgesch. N. T.*, p. 536; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 116, etc.

[2] *On the Canon*, p. 65.

[3] P. 300 f.

[4] Hilgenfeld, who had maintained that the *Clementines* did not use the fourth Gospel, was induced by the passage to which we refer to admit its use. Cf. *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 385 f.; *Die Evangelien*, p. 346 f.; *Der Kanon*, p. 29; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1854, p. 534, anm. 1; *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1865, p. 338. Volkmar is inclined to the same opinion, although not with the same decision. *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1854, p. 448 f.

[5] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 90 f.

[6] *On the Canon*, p. 252.

The first point which is apparent here is that there is a total difference both in the language and real meaning of these two passages. The Homily uses the word πύλη instead of the θύρα of the Gospel, and speaks of the gate of life instead of the door of the Sheepfold. We have already[1] discussed the passage in the *Shepherd* of Hermas, in which similar reference is made to the gate (πύλη) into the kingdom of God, and need not here repeat our argument. In Matt. vii. 13, 14 we have the direct description of the gate (πύλη) which leads to life (εἰς τὴν ζωήν), and we have elsewhere quoted the Messianic Psalm cxviii. 19, 20: "This is the gate of the Lord (αὕτη ἡ πύλη τοῦ Κυρίου);[2] the righteous shall enter into it." In another place the author of the *Homilies*, referring to a passage parallel to, but differing from, Matt. xxiii. 2, which we have elsewhere considered,[3] and which is derived from a Gospel different from ours, says: "Hear *them* (Scribes and Pharisees who sit upon Moses's seat), he said, as entrusted with the key of the kingdom which is knowledge, which alone is able to open the gate of life (πύλη τῆς ζωῆς), through which alone is the entrance to Eternal life."[4] Now, in the very next chapter to that in which the saying which we are discussing occurs, a very few lines after it, indeed, we have the following passage: "Indeed, he said further: 'I am he concerning whom Moses prophesied, saying: 'a prophet shall the Lord our God raise up to you from among your brethren as also (he raised) me; hear ye him regarding all things, but whosoever will not hear that prophet he shall die.'"[5] There is no such saying in the canonical Gospels or other books of the New Testament attributed to Jesus, but a quotation from Deuteronomy xviii. 15 f., materially different from this, occurs twice in the Acts of the Apostles, once being put into the mouth of Peter applied to Jesus,[6] and the second time also applied to him, being quoted by Stephen.[7] It is quite clear that the writer is quoting from uncanonical sources, and here is another express declaration regarding himself: "I am he," etc., which is quite in the spirit of the preceding passage which we are discussing, and probably derived from the same source. In another place we find the following argument: "But the way is the manner of life, as also Moses says: 'Behold I have set before thy face the way of life, and the way of death';[8] and in agreement the teacher said: 'Enter ye through the narrow and straitened way through which ye shall enter into life'; and in another place, a certain person inquiring, 'What shall I do to inherit eternal life?' he intimated the Commandments of the Law."[9] It has to be observed that the *Homilies* teach the doctrine

[1] P. 438 f.
[2] Ps. cxvii. 20, *Sept.*
[3] P. 308 f.
[4] *Hom.*, iii. 18.
[5] *Ib.*, iii. 53.
[6] Acts iii. 22.
[7] *Ib.*, vii. 37.
[8] Deut. xxx. 15.
[9] *Hom.*, xviii. 17.

that the spirit in Jesus Christ had already appeared in Adam, and by a species of transmigration passed through Moses and the Patriarchs and prophets: "who from the beginning of the world, changing names and forms, passes through Time (*τὸν αἰῶνα τρέχει*), until, attaining his own seasons, being on account of his labours anointed by the mercy of God, he shall have rest for ever."[1] Just in the same way, therefore, as the *Homilies* represent Jesus as quoting a prophecy of Moses, and altering it to a personal declaration, "I am the prophet," etc., so here again they make him adopt this saying of Moses and, "being the true prophet," declare: "I am the gate or the way of life"—inculcating the same commandments of the law which the Gospel of the *Homilies* represents Jesus as coming to confirm and not to abolish. The whole system of doctrine of the *Clementines*, as we shall presently see, indicated here even by the definition of "the true prophet," is so fundamentally opposed to that of the fourth Gospel that there is no reasonable ground for supposing that the author made use of it; and this brief saying, varying as it does in language and sense from the parallel in the Gospel, cannot prove acquaintance with it. There is good reason to believe that the author of the fourth Gospel, who most undeniably derived materials from earlier Evangelical works, may have drawn from a source likewise used by the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and thence many analogies might well be presented with quotations from that or kindred Gospels. We find, further, this community of source in the fact that in the fourth Gospel, without actual quotation, there is a reference to Moses, and, no doubt, to the very passage (Deut. xviii. 15) which the Gospel of the *Clementines* puts into the mouth of Jesus, John v. 46: "For had ye believed Moses ye would believe me, for he wrote of me." Whilst the Ebionite Gospel gave prominence to this view of the case, the dogmatic system of the Logos Gospel did not permit of more than mere reference to it.

The next passage pointed out as derived from the Johannine Gospel occurs in the same chapter: "My sheep hear my voice."

Hom. iii. 52.	John x. 27.
Τὰ ἐμὰ πρόβατα ἀκούει τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς.	Τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούει.

There was no more common representation amongst the Jews of the relation between God and his people than that of a Shepherd and his sheep,[2] nor any more current expression than "hearing his voice." This brief anonymous saying was in all probability derived from the same source as the preceding, which cannot be

[1] *Hom.*, iii. 20.
[2] Cf. Isaiah xl. 11; liii. 6; Ezek. xxxiv.; Zech. xi.; Hebrews xiii. 20.

identified with the fourth Gospel. Tradition, and the acknowledged existence of other written records of the teaching of Jesus, oppose any exclusive claim to this fragmentary saying.

We have already discussed the third passage regarding the new birth in connection with Justin,[1] and may therefore pass on to the last and most important passage, to which we have referred as contained in the concluding portion of the *Homilies* first published by Dressel in 1853. We subjoin it in contrast with the parallel in the fourth Gospel :—

Hom. xix. 22.	John ix.[2] 1–3.
Wherefore also our Teacher when we inquired regarding the man blind from birth and whose sight was restored by him if this man had sinned or his parents that he should be born blind, answered in explanation : Neither this man sinned at all nor his parents, but that through him the power of God might be made manifest, healing the sins of ignorance.	And as he was passing by, he saw a man blind from birth. 2. And his disciples asked him saying : Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents that he should be born blind ? 3. Jesus answered, Neither this man sinned, nor his parents, but that the works of God might be made manifest in him.
Ὅθεν καὶ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν περὶ τοῦ ἐκ γενετῆς πηροῦ καὶ ἀναβλέψαντος παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξετάζων ἐρωτήσασιν, εἰ οὗτος ἥμαρτεν ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ, ἀπεκρίνατο· οὔτε οὗτός τι ἥμαρτεν, οὔτε οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἵνα δι' αὐτοῦ φανερωθῇ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἀγνοίας ἰωμένη τὰ ἁμαρτήματα.	1. *Καὶ παράγων εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς.* 2. *Καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες· Ῥαββεί, τίς ἥμαρτεν, οὗτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ ;* 3. *Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· Οὔτε οὗτος ἥμαρτεν οὔτε οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ.*

It is necessary that we should consider the context of this passage in the Homily, the characteristics of which are markedly opposed to the theory that it was derived from the fourth Gospel. We must mention that, in the *Clementines*, the Apostle Peter is represented as maintaining that the Scriptures are not all true, but are mixed up with what is false, and that on this account, and in order to inculcate the necessity of distinguishing between the true and the false, Jesus taught his disciples, "Be ye approved money-changers"[2] —an injunction not found in our Gospels. One of the points which Peter denies is the fall of Adam —a doctrine which, as Neander remarked, "he must combat as blasphemy."[3] At

[1] P. 472 f.

[2] *Hom.*, iii. 50, cf. 9, 42 f.; ii. 38. The author denies that Moses wrote the Pentateuch (*Hom.*, iii. 47 f.).

[3] *Hom.*, iii. 20 f., 42 f., viii. 10. "*Die Lehre von einem Sundenfalle des ersten Menschen musste der Verfasser der Clementinen als Gotteslasterung bekampfen*" (Neander, *K. G.*, ii., p. 612 f.). The Jews at that period held a similar belief (Eisenmenger, *Entd. Judenthum*, i., p. 336). Adam, according to the *Homilies*, not only did not sin, but, as a true prophet possessed of the Spirit of God which afterwards was in Jesus, he was incapable of sin (Schliemann, *Die Clementinen*, pp. 130, 176 f., 178 f.).

the part we are considering he is discussing with Simon—under whose detested personality, as we have elsewhere shown, the Apostle Paul is really attacked—and refuting the charges he brings forward regarding the origin and continuance of evil. The Apostle Peter, in the course of the discussion, asserts that evil is the same as pain and death, but that evil does not exist eternally, and, indeed, does not really exist at all, for pain and death are only accidents without permanent force—pain is merely the disturbance of harmony, and death nothing but the separation of soul from body.[1] The passions also must be classed amongst the things which are accidental, and are not always to exist; but these, although capable of abuse, are in reality beneficial to the soul when properly restrained, and carry out the will of God. The man who gives them unbridled course ensures his own punishment.[2] Simon inquires why men die prematurely and diseases periodically come, and also visitations of demons and of madness and other afflictions; in reply to which Peter explains that parents, by following their own pleasure in all things and neglecting proper sanitary considerations, produce a multitude of evils for their children, and this either through carelessness or ignorance.[3] Then follows the passage we are discussing: "Wherefore also our Teacher," etc., and at the end of the quotation he continues: "and truly such sufferings ensue in consequence of ignorance"; and, giving an instance,[4] he proceeds: "Now the sufferings which you before mentioned are the consequence of ignorance, and certainly not of an evil act, which has been committed,"[5] etc. It is quite apparent that the peculiar variation from the parallel in the fourth Gospel in the latter part of the quotation is not accidental, but is the point upon which the whole propriety of the quotation depends. In the Gospel of the *Clementines* the man is not blind from his birth, "that the works of God might be made manifest in him"—a doctrine which would be revolting to the author of the *Homilies*—but the calamity has befallen him in consequence of some error of ignorance on the part of his parents which brings its punishment; and "the power of God" is made manifest in healing the sins of ignorance. The reply of Jesus is a professed quotation, and it varies very substantially from the parallel

[1] *Hom.*, xix. 20.

[2] *Ib.*, xix. 21. According to the author of the *Clementines*, evil is the consequence of sin, and is, on one hand, necessary for the punishment of sin; but, on the other, beneficial as leading men to improvement and upward progress. Suffering is represented as wholesome, and intended for the elevation of man (cf. *Hom.*, ii. 13; vii. 2; viii. 11). Death was originally designed for man, and was not introduced by Adam's "fall," but is really necessary to nature, the Homilist considers (cf. Schliemann, *Die Clementinen*, p. 177, p. 168 f.).

[3] *Ib.*, xix. 22.

[4] *Ib.*, xix. 22.

[5] *Ib.*, xix. 22.

in the Gospel, presenting evidently a distinctly different version of the episode. The substitution of πηρός for τυφλός in the opening is also significant, more especially as Justin likewise in his general remark, which we have discussed, uses the same word. Assuming the passage in the fourth Gospel to be the account of a historical episode, as apologists, of course, maintain, the case stands thus :—The author of the *Homilies* introduces a narrative of a historical incident in the life of Jesus, which may have been, and probably was, reported in many early Gospels in language which, though analogous to, is at the same time decidedly different, in the part, which is a professed quotation, from that of the fourth Gospel, and presents another and natural comment upon the central event. The reference to the historical incident is, of course, no evidence of dependence on the fourth Gospel, which, although it may be the only accidentally surviving work which contains the narrative, had no prescriptive and exclusive property in it ; and so far from the partial agreement in the narrative proving the use of the fourth Gospel, the only remarkable point is, that all narratives of the same event and reports of words actually spoken do not more perfectly agree, while, on the other hand, the very decided variation in the reply of Jesus, according to the Homily, from that given in the fourth Gospel leads to the distinct presumption that it is not the source of the quotation.

It is unreasonable to assert that such a reference, without the slightest indication of the source from which the author derived his information, must be dependent on one particular work, more especially when the part which is given as distinct quotation substantially differs from the record in that work. We have already illustrated this on several occasions, and may once more offer an instance. If the first Synoptic had unfortunately perished, like so many other gospels of the early Church, and in the *Clementines* we met with the quotation, " Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven " (Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν), apologists would certainly assert, according to the principle upon which they act in the present case, that this quotation was clear evidence of the use of Luke vi. 20, " Blessed are ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God " (Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ), more especially as a few codices actually insert τῷ πνεύματι, the slight variations being merely ascribed to free quotation from memory. In point of fact, however, the third Synoptic might not at the time have been in existence, and the quotation might have been derived, as it is, from Matt. v. 3. Nothing is more certain and undeniable than the fact that the author of the fourth Gospel made use of materials derived from oral tradition and earlier records for its composition.

It is equally undeniable that other gospels had access to the same materials, and made use of them; and a comparison of our three Synoptics renders very evident the community of materials, including the use of the one by the other, as well as the diversity of literary handling to which those materials were subjected. It is impossible with reason to deny that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, for instance, as well as other earlier evangelical works now lost, may have drawn from the same sources as the fourth Gospel, and that narratives derived from the one may present analogies with the other whilst still perfectly independent of it. Whatever private opinion, therefore, any one may form as to the source of the anonymous quotations which we have been considering, it is evident that they are totally insufficient to prove that the author of the *Clementine Homilies* must have made use of the fourth Gospel, and consequently they do not establish even the contemporary existence of that work. If such quotations, moreover, could be traced with fifty times greater probability to the fourth Gospel, it is obvious that they could do nothing towards establishing its historical character and apostolic origin.

Leaving, however, the few and feeble analogies by which apologists vainly seek to establish the existence of the fourth Gospel and its use by the author of the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*, and considering the question for a moment from a wider point of view, the results already attained are more than confirmed. The doctrines held and strongly enunciated in the *Clementines* seem to us to exclude the supposition that the author can have made use of a work so fundamentally at variance with all his views as the fourth Gospel, and it is certain that, holding those opinions, he could hardly have regarded such a Gospel as an apostolic and authoritative document. Space will not permit our entering adequately into this argument, and we must refer our readers to works more immediately devoted to the examination of the *Homilies* for a close analysis of their dogmatic teaching; but we may in the briefest manner point out some of their more prominent doctrines in contrast with those of the Johannine Gospel.

One of the leading and most characteristic ideas of the *Clementine Homilies* is the essential identity of Judaism and Christianity. Christ revealed nothing new with regard to God, but promulgated the very same truth concerning him as Adam, Moses, and the Patriarchs, and the right belief is that Moses and Jesus were essentially one and the same.[1] Indeed, it may be said that the teaching of the *Homilies* is more Jewish than Christian. In the preliminary Epistle of the Apostle Peter to the Apostle James, when sending the book, Peter entreats that

[1] *Hom.*, xvii. 4; xviii. 14; viii. 6.

James will not give it to any of the Gentiles,[1] and James says: "Necessarily and rightly our Peter reminded us to take precautions for the security of the truth, that we should not communicate the books of his preachings, sent to us, indiscriminately to all, but to him who is good and discreet and chosen to teach, and who is *circumcised*,[2] being faithful,"[3] etc. Clement also is represented as describing his conversion to Christianity in the following terms: "For this cause I fled for refuge to the Holy God and Law of the Jews, with faith in the certain conclusion that, by the righteous judgment of God, both the Law is prescribed and the soul beyond doubt everywhere receives the desert of its actions."[4] Peter recommends the inhabitants of Tyre to follow what are really Jewish rites, and to hear "as the God-fearing Jews have heard."[5] The Jew has the same truth as the Christian: "For as there is one teaching by both (Moses and Jesus), God accepts him who believes either of these."[6] The Law was in fact given by Adam as a true prophet knowing all things, and it is called "Eternal," and neither to be abrogated by enemies nor falsified by the impious.[7] The author, therefore, protests against the idea that Christianity is any new thing, and insists that Jesus came to confirm, not abrogate, the Mosaic Law.[8] On the other hand, the author of the fourth Gospel represents Christianity in strong contrast and antagonism to Judaism. In his antithetical system, the religion of Jesus is opposed to Judaism as well as all other belief, as light to darkness and life to death.[9] The Law which Moses gave is treated as merely national, and neither of general application nor intended to be permanent, being only addressed to the Jews. It is perpetually referred to as the "Law of the Jews," "your Law"—and the Jewish festivals as Feasts of the Jews; and Jesus neither held the one in any consideration nor did he scruple to show his indifference to the other.[10] The very name of "the Jews," indeed, is used as an equivalent for the enemies of Christ.[11] The religion of Jesus is not only absolute, but it communicates knowledge of the Father which the Jews did not previously possess.[12] The inferiority of Mosaism is everywhere represented: "And out of his fulness all we received, and grace for grace. *Because* the *Law* was given

[1] *Ep. Petri ad Jacob.*, § 1.
[2] Cf. Galatians ii. 7.
[3] *Contestatio*, § 1.
[4] *Hom.*, iv. 22.
[5] *Ib.*, vii. 4; cf. ii. 19, 20; xiii. 4.
[6] *Ib.*, viii. 6, cf. 7.
[7] *Ib.*, viii. 10.
[8] *Ib.*, iii. 51.
[9] John xii. 46; i. 4, 5, 7 f.; iii. 19–21; v. 24; viii. 12; ix. 5; xii. 35 f.; xiv. 6.
[10] *Ib.*, ii. 13; iv. 20 f.; v. 1, 16, 18; vi. 4; vii. 2, 19, 22; viii. 17; ix. 16, 28, 29; x. 34; xv. 25, etc.
[11] *Ib.*, vi. 42, 52, etc.
[12] *Ib.*, i. 18; viii. 19, 31 f., 54, 55; xv. 21 f.; xvii. 25, 26.

through Moses; *grace and truth* came through Jesus Christ."[1] "Verily, verily I say unto you: Moses did not give you the bread from Heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven."[2] The fundamental difference of Christianity from Judaism will further appear as we proceed.

The most essential principle of the *Clementines*, again, is Monotheism — the absolute oneness of God — which the author vehemently maintains as well against the ascription of divinity to Christ as against heathen Polytheism and the Gnostic theory of the Demiurge as distinguished from the Supreme God. Christ not only is not God, but he never asserted himself to be so.[3] He wholly ignores the doctrine of the Logos, and his speculation is confined to the Σοφία, the Wisdom of Proverbs viii., etc., and is, as we shall see, at the same time a less developed and very different doctrine from that of the fourth Gospel.[4] The idea of a hypostatic Trinity seems to be quite unknown to him, and would have been utterly abhorrent to his mind as sheer Polytheism. On the other hand, the fourth Gospel proclaims the doctrine of a hypostatic Trinity in a more advanced form than any other writing of the New Testament. It is, indeed, the fundamental principle of the work, as the doctrine of the Logos is its most characteristic feature. In the beginning the Word not only was with God, but "the Word was God" (θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος).[5] He is the "only begotten God" (μονογενὴς θεός),[6] and his absolutely divine nature is asserted both by the Evangelist and in express terms in the discourses of Jesus.[7] Nothing could be more opposed to the principles of the *Clementines*.

According to the *Homilies*, the same Spirit, the Σοφία, appeared in Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and finally in Jesus, who are the only "true prophets," and are called the seven Pillars (ἑπτὰ στῦλοι) of the world.[8] These seven persons, therefore, are identical, the same true Prophet and Spirit "who from the beginning of the world, changing names and forms, passes through time,"[9] and these men were thus essentially the same as Jesus. As Neander rightly observes, the author of the *Homilies* "saw in Jesus a new appearance of that Adam whom he had ever venerated as the source of all the true and divine in man."[10] We need not point out how different these views are from

[1] John i. 16, 17; cf. x. 1, 8. [2] *Ib.*, vi. 32 f. [3] *Hom.*, xvi. 15 f.
[4] Cf. Dorner, *Lehre Pers. Christi*, i., p. 334. [5] John i. 1.
[6] *Ib.*, i. 18. This is the reading of the *Cod. Sinaiticus*, of the *Cod. Vaticanus*, and *Cod. C.*, as well as of other ancient MSS., and it must be accepted as the best authenticated.
[7] *Ib.*, i. 2; v. 17 f.; x. 30 f., 38; xiv. 7 f., 23; xvii. 5, 21 f., etc.
[8] *Hom.*, iii. 20 f.; ii. 15; viii. 10; xvii. 4; xviii. 14.
[9] *Ib.*, iii. 20. [10] *K. G.*, ii., p. 622; cf. *Hom.*, iii. 18 f.

the Logos doctrine of the fourth Gospel. In other points there is an equally wide gulf between the *Clementines* and the fourth Gospel. According to the author of the *Homilies*, the chief dogma of true religion is Monotheism. Belief in Christ, in the specific Johannine sense, is nowhere inculcated, and where belief is spoken of it is merely belief in God. No dogmatic importance whatever is attached to faith in Christ or to his sufferings, death, and resurrection, and of the doctrines of Atonement and Redemption there is nothing in the *Homilies*—everyone must make his own reconciliation with God, and bear the punishment of his own sins.[1] On the other hand, the representation of Jesus as the Lamb of God taking away the sins of the world[2] is the very basis of the fourth Gospel. The passages are innumerable in which belief in Jesus is insisted upon as essential. "He that believeth in the Son hath eternal life, but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him"[3]....."for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."[4] In fact, the whole of Christianity, according to the author of the fourth Gospel, is concentrated in the possession of faith in Christ.[5] Belief in God alone is never held to be sufficient; belief in Christ is necessary for salvation; he died for the sins of the world, and is the object of faith, by which alone forgiveness and justification before God can be secured. The same discrepancy is apparent in smaller details. In the *Clementines* the Apostle Peter is the principal actor, and is represented as the chief amongst the Apostles. In the Epistle of Clement to James, which precedes the *Homilies*, Peter is described in the following terms: "Simon, who, on account of his true faith and of the principles of his doctrine, which were most sure, was appointed to be the foundation of the Church; and for this reason his name was by the unerring voice of Jesus himself changed to Peter; the first-fruit of our Lord; the first of the Apostles; to whom first the Father revealed the son; whom the Christ deservedly pronounced blessed; the called and chosen and companion and fellow-traveller (of Jesus); the admirable and approved disciple, who as fittest of all was commanded to enlighten the West, the darker part of the world, and was enabled to guide it aright," etc.[6] He is here represented as the Apostle to the Heathen, the hated Apostle Paul being robbed of that honourable title; and he is, in the spirit of this introduction, made to play, throughout, the first part amongst the Apostles. In the

[1] *Hom.*, iii. 6 f.
[2] John i. 29; cf. iii. 14 f., iv. 42, etc.
[3] *Ib.*, iii. 36; cf. 16 f.
[4] *Ib.*, viii. 24.
[5] *Ib.*, iii. 14 f.; v. 24 f.; vi. 29, 35 f., 40, 47, 65; vii. 38; viii. 24, 51; ix. 25 f.; x. 9, 28; xi. 25 f.; xii. 47; xiv. 6; xv. 5 f.; xvi. 9; xvii. 2 f.; xx. 31.
[6] *Ep. Clem. ad. Jacobum*, § 1.

fourth Gospel, however, he is assigned a place quite secondary to John, who is the disciple whom Jesus loved, and who leans on his bosom.[1] We shall only mention one other point. The Homilist, when attacking the Apostle Paul, under the name of Simon the Magician, for his boast that he had not been taught by man, but by a revelation of Jesus Christ,[2] whom he had only seen in a vision, inquires: "Why, then, did the Teacher remain and discourse a whole year to us who were awake, if you became his Apostle after a single hour of instruction?"[3] As Neander aptly remarks: "If the author had known from the Johannine Gospel that the teaching of Christ had continued for *several years*, he would certainly have had particularly good reason instead of one year to set *several*."[4] It is obvious that an author with so vehement an animosity against Paul would assuredly have strengthened his argument by adopting the more favourable statement of the fourth Gospel as to the duration of the ministry of Jesus, had he been acquainted with that work.

Our attention must now be turned to the anonymous composition known as the *Epistle to Diognetus*, general particulars regarding which we have elsewhere given.[5] This Epistle, it is admitted, does not contain any quotation from any evangelical work, but on the strength of some supposed references it is claimed by apologists as evidence for the existence of the fourth Gospel. Tischendorf, who only devotes a dozen lines to this work, states his case as follows: "Although this short apologetic Epistle contains no precise quotation from any gospel, yet it has repeated references to evangelical, and particularly to Johannine, passages. For when the author writes, ch. 6: 'Christians dwell in the world, but they are not of the world'; and in ch. 10: 'For God has loved men, for whose sakes he made the world.....to whom he sent his only begotten Son,' the reference to John xvii. 11 ('But they are in the world'); 14 ('The world hateth them, for they are not of the world'); 16 ('They are not of the world as I am not of the world'); and to John iii. 16 ('God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son'), is hardly to be mistaken."[6]

Dr. Westcott still more emphatically claims the Epistle as evidence for the fourth Gospel, and we shall, in order impartially to consider the question, likewise quote his remarks in full upon

[1] Cf. John xiii. 23–25; xix. 26 f.; xx. 2 f.; xxi. 3 f., 7, 20 f.
[2] Gal. i. 12 f.
[3] *Hom.*, xvii. 19.
[4] *K. G.*, ii., p. 624, anm. 1.
[5] P. 320 f.
[6] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 40. We may mention that neither Tischendorf nor Dr. Westcott gives the Greek of any of the passages pointed out in the Epistle, nor do they give the original text of the parallels in the Gospel.

the point; but, as he introduces his own paraphrase of the context in a manner which does not properly convey its true nature to a reader who has not the Epistle before him, we shall take the liberty of putting the actual quotations in italics, and the rest must be taken as purely the language of Dr. Westcott. We shall hereafter show also the exact separation which exists between phrases which are here, with the mere indication of some omission, brought together to form the supposed references to the fourth Gospel. Dr. Westcott says: "In one respect the two parts of the book are united,[1] inasmuch as they both exhibit a combination of the teaching of St. Paul and St. John. The love of God, it is said in the letter to Diognetus, is the source of love in the Christian, who must needs '*love God who thus first loved him*' (προαγαπήσαντα), and find an expression for this love by loving his neighbour, whereby he will be '*an imitator of God.*' '*For God loved men, for whose sakes He made the world, to whom He subjected all things that are in the earth.....unto whom* (πρός) *He sent His only begotten Son, to whom He promised the kingdom in heaven* (τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ βασιλείαν), *and will give it to those who love him.*' God's will is mercy; '*He sent His Son as wishing to save* (ὡς σώζων).....*and not to condemn*,' and as witnesses of this '*Christians dwell in the world, though they are not of the world.*'"[2] At the close of the paragraph he proceeds: "The presence of the teaching of St. John is here placed beyond all doubt. There are, however, no direct references to the Gospels throughout the letter, nor indeed any allusions to our Lord's discourses."[3]

As we have already stated, the writer of the *Epistle to Diognetus* is unknown; Diognetus, the friend to whom it is addressed, is equally unknown; the letter is neither mentioned nor quoted by any of the Fathers, nor by any ancient writer, and there is no external evidence as to the date of the composition. It existed

[1] This is a reference to the admitted fact that the first ten chapters are by a different author from the writer of the last two.

[2] *On the Canon*, p. 77. Dr. Westcott continues, referring to the later and more recent part of the Epistle: "So in the conclusion we read that 'the Word who was from the beginning..... at His appearance speaking boldly manifested the mysteries of the Father to those who were judged faithful by Him.' And these again to whom the Word speaks, 'from love of that which is revealed to them,' share their knowledge with others." It is not necessary to discuss this, both because of the late date of the two chapters and because there is certainly no reference at all to the Gospel in the words. We must, however, add that, as the quotation is given, it conveys quite a false impression of the text. We may just mention that the phrase which Dr. Westcott quotes as "the Word who was from the beginning" is in the text, "This is he who was from the beginning" (οὗτος ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς), although "the Word" is in the context, and no doubt intended.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 78.

only in one codex, destroyed at Strasburg during the Franco-German war, the handwriting of which was referred to the thirteenth or fourteenth century; but it is far from certain that it was so old. The last two chapters are a falsification by a later writer than the author of the first ten. There is no internal evidence in this brief didactic composition requiring or even suggesting its assignment to the second or third centuries; but, on the contrary, we venture to assert that there is evidence, both internal and external, justifying the belief that it was written at a comparatively recent date. Apart from the uncertainty of date, however, there is no allusion in it to any Gospel. Even if there were, the testimony of a letter by an unknown writer at an unknown period could not have any weight; but, under the actual circumstances, the *Epistle to Diognetus* furnishes absolutely no testimony at all for the apostolical origin and historical character of the fourth Gospel.[1]

The fulness with which we have discussed the supposed testimony of Basilides[2] renders it unnecessary for us to re-enter at any length into the argument as to his knowledge of the fourth Gospel. Tischendorf[3] and Dr. Westcott[4] assert that two passages—namely: "The true light which lighteth every man came into the world," corresponding with John i. 9; and: "mine hour is not yet come," agreeing with John ii. 4, which are introduced by Hippolytus in his work against Heresies[5] with a subjectless φησί, "he says"—are quotations made in some lost work by Basilides. We have shown that Hippolytus and other writers of his time were in the habit of quoting passages from works by the founders of sects and by their later followers without any distinction, an utterly vague φησί doing service equally for all. This is the case in the present instance, and there is no legitimate reason for assigning these passages to Basilides himself, but, on the contrary, many considerations which forbid our doing so, which we have elsewhere detailed.

These remarks most fully apply to Valentinus, whose supposed quotations we have exhaustively discussed,[6] as well as the one passage given by Hippolytus containing a sentence found in John x. 8,[7] the only one which can be pointed out. We have distinctly proved that the quotations in question are not assignable to Valentinus himself—a fact which even apologists admit. There is no just ground for asserting that his terminology was derived from

[1] Readers interested in more minutely discussing the point whether the Epistle even indicates the existence of the fourth Gospel are referred to the complete edition, 1879, ii., pp. 355–368, in which the question was argued and printed in smaller type.

[2] P. 322 f.

[3] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 52.

[4] *On the Canon*, p. 256, note 3.

[5] vii. 22, 27.

[6] P. 330 f.

[7] *Adv. Hær.*, vi. 35.

the fourth Gospel, the whole having been in current use long before that Gospel was composed. There is no evidence whatever that Valentinus was acquainted with such a work.

We must generally remark, however, with regard to Basilides, Valentinus, and all such Heresiarchs and writers, that, even if it could be shown, as actually it cannot, that they were acquainted with the fourth Gospel, the fact would only prove the existence of the work at a late period in the second century, but would furnish no evidence of the slightest value regarding its apostolic origin, or towards establishing its historical value. On the other hand, if, as apologists assert, these heretics possessed the fourth Gospel, their deliberate and total rejection of the work furnishes evidence positively antagonistic to its claims. It is difficult to decide whether their rejection of the Gospel or their ignorance of its existence is the more unfavourable alternative.

The dilemma is the very same in the case of Marcion. We have already fully discussed his knowledge of our Gospels, and need not add anything here. It is not pretended that he made any use of the fourth Gospel, and the only ground upon which it is argued that he supplies evidence even of its existence is the vague general statement of Tertullian, that Marcion rejected the Gospels "which are put forth as genuine, and under the name of Apostles, or, at least, of contemporaries of the Apostles," denying their truth and integrity, and maintaining the sole authority of his own Gospel.[1] We have shown how unwarrantable it is to affirm from such data that Marcion knew, and deliberately repudiated, the four canonical Gospels. The Fathers, with uncritical haste and zeal, assumed that the Gospels adopted by the Church at the close of the second and beginning of the third centuries must equally have been invested with canonical authority from the first, and Tertullian took it for granted that Marcion, of whom he knew very little, must have actually rejected the four Gospels of his own Canon. Even Dr. Westcott admits that "it is uncertain whether Tertullian in the passage quoted speaks from a knowledge of what Marcion may have written on the subject, or simply from his own point of sight."[2] There is not the slightest evidence that Marcion knew the fourth Gospel, and, if he did, it would be perfectly inexplicable that he did not adopt it as peculiarly favourable to his own views. If he was acquainted with the work, and, nevertheless, rejected it as false and adulterated, his testimony is obviously opposed to the Apostolic origin and historical accuracy of the fourth Gospel, and the critical acumen which he exhibited in his selection of the Pauline Epistles renders his judgment of greater weight than that of most of the Fathers.

[1] *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 3, 4.

[2] *On the Canon*, p. 276, note 1.

We have now reached an epoch when no evidence regarding the fourth Gospel can have much weight, and the remaining witnesses need not detain us long.

We have already discussed at length the evidence of Tatian in connection with the Synoptics,[1] and shall presently return to the question of the *Diatessaron* as it affects the fourth Gospel. We have now briefly to refer to the address to the Greeks (Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας), and to ascertain what testimony it bears regarding that Gospel. It was composed after the death of Justin, and scarcely dates earlier than the beginning of the last quarter of the second century. No Gospel and no work of the New Testament is mentioned in this composition, but Tischendorf[2] and others point out one or two supposed references to passages in the fourth Gospel. The first of these in order is one indicated by Dr. Westcott,[3] but to which Tischendorf does not call attention: "God was in the beginning; but we have learned that the beginning is the power of Reason (Θεὸς ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ, τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν λόγου δύναμιν παρειλήφαμεν). For the Lord of the Universe (δεσπότης τῶν ὅλων) being himself the substance (ὑπόστασις) of all, in that creation had not been accomplished was alone, but inasmuch as he was all power, and himself the substance of things visible and invisible, all things were with him (σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα). With him by means of rational power the Reason (Λόγος) itself also which was in him subsisted. But by the will of his simplicity, Reason (Λόγος) springs forth; but the Reason (Λόγος) not proceeding in vain, because the first-born work (ἔργον πρωτότοκον) of the Father. Him we know to be the Beginning of the world (Τοῦτον ἴσμεν τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἀρχήν). But he came into existence by division, not by cutting off, for that which is cut off is separated from the first; but that which is divided, receiving the choice of administration, did not render him defective from whom it was taken, etc. And as the Logos (Reason), in the beginning begotten, begat again our creation, himself for himself creating the matter (Καὶ καθάπερ ὁ Λόγος, ἐν ἀρχῇ γεννηθείς, ἀντεγέννησε τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ποίησιν, αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ τὴν ὕλην δημιουργήσας), so I," etc.[4]

[1] P. 366 f.

[2] *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 17.

[3] *On the Canon*, p. 278, note 2. [In the 4th ed., however, Dr. Westcott puts it within brackets, adding: "This reference is not certain"—p. 317, n. 2.]

[4] *Orat. ad Grecos*, § 5. As this passage is of some obscurity, we subjoin, for the sake of impartiality, an independent translation taken from Dr. Donaldson's able *History of Christ. Lit. and Doctrine*, iii., p. 42: "God was in the beginning, but we have understood that the beginning was a power of reason. For the Lord of all, Himself being the substance of all, was alone in so far as the creation had not yet taken place, but as far as He was all power and the substance of things seen and unseen, all things were with Him: along with Him also by means of rational power, the reason which was in Him supported them. But by the will of his simplicity, the reason leaps forth; but the reason,

It is quite evident that this doctrine of the Logos is not that of the fourth Gospel, from which it cannot have been derived. Tatian himself[1] seems to assert that he derived it from the Old Testament. We have quoted the passage at length that it might be clearly understood; and with the opening words, we presume, for he does not quote at all, but merely indicates the chapter, Dr. Westcott compares John i. 1: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, κ.τ.λ.). The statement of Tatian is quite different — "*God* was in the beginning" (Θεὸς ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ); and he certainly did not identify the Word with God, so as to transform the statement of the Gospel into this simple affirmation. In all probability his formula was merely based upon Genesis i. 1: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" (ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.).[2] The expressions: "But we have learned that the Beginning (ἀρχή) was the power of Reason," etc., "but the Reason (Λόγος) not proceeding in vain became the first-born work (ἔργον πρωτότοκον) of the Father. Him we know to be the Beginning (ἀρχή) of the world," recall many early representations of the Logos, to which we have already referred: Prov. viii. 22: "The Lord created me the Beginning (ἀρχή) of his ways for his works (ἔργα), 23. Before the ages he established me, in the beginning (ἐν ἀρχῇ) before he made the earth," etc. In the Apocalypse also the Word is called "the Beginning (ἀρχή) of the creation of God," and it will be remembered that Justin gives testimony from Prov. viii. 21 f., "that God begat before all the creatures a Beginning (ἀρχήν), a certain rational Power (δύναμιν λογικήν), out of himself,"[3] etc., and elsewhere: "As the Logos declared through Solomon, that this same.....had been begotten of God, before all created beings, both Beginning (ἀρχή)," etc.[4] We need not, however, refer to the numerous passages in Philo and in Justin, not derived from the fourth Gospel, which point to a different source for Tatian's doctrine. It is sufficient that both his opinions and his terminology differ distinctly from that Gospel.[5]

not having gone from one who became empty thereby, is the first-born work of the Father. Him we know to be the beginning of the world. But He came into existence by sharing (μερισμός), not by cutting off; for that which is cut off is separated from the first; but that which is shared, receiving a selection of the work, did not render Him defective from whom it was taken, etc. And as the Word begotten in the beginning begot in his turn our creation, He Himself fashioning the material for Himself, so I, etc." (cf. Dorner, *Lehre Pers. Christi*, i., p. 437 f.).

[1] § 12, cf. § 20.

[2] Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 43.

[3] *Dial.* 61.

[4] *Ib.*, 62.

[5] We have already mentioned that the Gospel according to Peter contained the doctrine of the Logos.

The next passage we subjoin in contrast with the parallel in the fourth Gospel :—

Orat. ad Græcos, § xiii.	John i. 5.
And this, therefore, is (the meaning of) the saying :	And the light shineth in the darkness ;
The darkness comprehends not the light.	and the darkness comprehended it not.
Καὶ τοῦτο ἔστιν ἄρα τὸ εἰρημένον· Ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς οὐ καταλαμβάνει.	Καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.

The context to this passage in the Oration is as follows : Tatian is arguing about the immortality of the soul, and he states that the soul is not in itself immortal, but mortal ; but that, nevertheless, it is possible for it not to die. If it do not know the truth, it dies, but rises again at the end of the world, receiving eternal death as a punishment. "Again, however, it does not die, though it be for a time dissolved if it has acquired knowledge of God ; for, in itself, it is darkness, and there is nothing luminous in it ; and this, therefore, is (the meaning of) the saying, The darkness comprehends not the light. For the soul (*ψυχή*) did not itself save the spirit (*πνεῦμα*), but was saved by it, and the light comprehended the darkness. The Logos (Reason) truly is the light of God, but the ignorant soul is darkness (Ὁ Λόγος μέν ἐστι τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ φῶς, σκότος δὲ ἡ ἀνεπιστήμων ψυχή). For this reason, if it remain alone, it tends downwards to matter, dying with the flesh," etc.[1] The source of "the saying" is not mentioned, and it is evident that, even if it were taken to be a reference to the fourth Gospel, nothing would thereby be proved but the mere existence of the Gospel. "The saying," however, is distinctly different in language from the parallel in the Gospel, and it may be from a different Gospel. We have already remarked that Philo calls the Logos "the light,"[2] and, quoting in a peculiar form Ps. xxvi. 1, "For the Lord is my light (*φῶς*) and my Saviour," he goes on to say that, as the sun divides day and night, so, Moses says, "God divides light and darkness" (τὸν θεὸν φῶς καὶ σκότος διατειχίσαι).[3] When we turn away to things of sense we use "another light," which is in no way different from "darkness."[4] The constant use of the same similitude of light and darkness in the canonical Epistles[5] shows how current it was in the Church ; and nothing is more certain than the fact that it was neither originated by, nor confined to, the fourth Gospel.

[1] *Orat. ad Græcos*, § 13.

[2] *De Somniis*, i., § 13, Mangey, i. 632 ; cf. § 14 f., *De Mundi op.*, § 9, *ib.*, i. 7 (see p. 463, note 1).

[3] *De Somniis*, i., § 13.

[4] *Ib.*, i., § 14.

[5] 2 Cor. iv. 6 ; Ephes. v. 8–14 ; Coloss. i. 12, 13 ; 1 Thess. v. 5 ; 1 Tim. vi. 16 ; 1. Pet. ii. 9 ; cf. Rev. xxi. 23, 24 ; xxii. 5.

The third and last passage is as follows :—

ORAT. AD GRÆCOS, XIX.	JOHN I. 3.
We being such as this, do not pursue us with hatred, but, rejecting the Demons, follow the one God.	
All things were by (*ὑπό*) him, and without him was not anything made.	All things were made by (*διά*) him, and without him was not anything made that was made.
Πάντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέγονεν οὐδὲ ἕν·	*Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν.*

Tatian here speaks of God, and not of the Logos, and in this respect, as well as in language and context, the passage differs from the fourth Gospel. The phrase is not introduced as a quotation, and no reference is made to any Gospel. The purpose for which the words are used, again, rather points to the first chapters of Genesis than to the dogmatic prologue enunciating the doctrine of the Logos.[1] Under all these circumstances, the source from which the expression may have been derived cannot with certainty be ascertained, and, as in the preceding instance, even if it be assumed that the words show acquaintance with the fourth Gospel, nothing could be proved but the mere existence of the work about a century and a half after the events which it records. It is obvious that in no case does Tatian afford the slightest evidence of the Apostolic origin or historical veracity of the fourth Gospel.

Dr. Lightfoot points out another passage, § 4, *πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός*, which he compares with John iv. 24, where the same words occur. It is right to add that he himself remarks : "If it had stood alone I should certainly not have regarded it as decisive. But the epigrammatic form is remarkable, and it is a characteristic passage of the fourth Gospel."[2] Neither Tischendorf nor Dr. Westcott refers to it. The fact is, however, that the epigrammatic form only exists when the phrase is quoted without its context. "God is a spirit, not pervading matter, but the creator of material spirits, and of the forms that are in it. He is invisible and impalpable," etc. Further on, Tatian says (§ 15) : "For the perfect God is without flesh, but man is flesh," etc. A large part of the oration is devoted to discussing the nature of God, and the distinction between spirit (*πνεῦμα*) and soul (*ψυχή*), and it is unreasonable to assert that a man like Tatian could not make the declaration that God is a spirit without quoting the fourth Gospel.

Returning to the *Diatessaron*, the position of which in regard to Tatian we have already fully discussed, we must now briefly

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. viii. 6 ; Ephes. iii. 9 ; Heb. i. 2.
[2] *Contemp. Rev.*, 1877, p. 1135.

consider how it affects the argument as to the date and authorship of the fourth Gospel. It is needless to point out that no ascription of the work to the Apostle could be made in the Harmony. Let us suppose it to be even demonstrated beyond doubt that the *Diatessaron* of Tatian was compiled from our four canonical Gospels, in what degree does this establish the authenticity of the fourth Gospel as the work of the Apostle John? Even according to apologetic critics, as we have seen, the composition of the *Diatessaron* must be assigned to A.D. 170, and there are good reasons for dating it some years later.[1] Of course, the fourth Gospel must have been in existence before that date if it formed part of the *Diatessaron*. It must be remembered, however, that the Harmony was not an official or ecclesiastical compilation involving the idea of contents already recognised as canonical by the Church. On the contrary, the *Diatessaron* was the work of a heretic, and, so far from having ecclesiastical sanction on any grounds, it was condemned by the Church in the person of Theodoret, and the copies of it circulating in his diocese were confiscated. The grounds for this suppression which are stated are, it is true, the omission of genealogies; but still the tendency was considered mischievous. This judgment was pronounced little short of 300 years after its composition; but still, as the work of a heretic and an irresponsible writer, it is not possible to maintain that the Gospels out of which it was compiled must previously have long enjoyed the sanction of the Church.

How long must the fourth Gospel have been in existence before its supposed use by Tatian becomes reasonable? It has to be borne in mind that, in those days of manuscript books, a Gospel did not issue from the hands of the scribe like a volume from the University Press, with its author's name and a date on the title-page. A work of the literary excellence of the fourth Gospel, evidently pretending to have been written by the Apostle John, calling himself—for no one else did so—the "beloved disciple," would, in such an age, rapidly attain to acceptance, especially as it would, for the mass of Christians, if not for all without exception, have been impossible, even a year after such a manuscript work was circulated, to say when it had actually been composed. If we suppose it to have been in circulation twenty or twenty-five years, which would have been more than ample for the purpose, that would only carry back the date of the fourth Gospel to the middle of the second century; or if we even allow thirty or thirty-five years—an age at such a period—we do not get back beyond

[1] Zahn, for instance, as has already been pointed out, dates it "soon after A.D. 173" (*Forsch.*, p. 290 f.).

A.D. 140. More than this, if even so much need be conceded, is not demanded by the hypothesis that it was used by Tatian, and its presence in the *Diatessaron*, whilst giving us no information whatever as to the authorship or authenticity, would thus in no way warrant the ascription of the fourth Gospel to the Apostle John. As evidence for miracles and the reality of Divine revelation it has no real importance.

We have generally discussed the testimony of Dionysius of Corinth,[1] Melito of Sardis,[2] and Claudius Apollinaris,[3] and need not say more here. The fragments attributed to them neither mention nor quote the fourth Gospel, but in no case could they furnish evidence to authenticate the work. The same remarks apply to Athenagoras.[4] Dr. Westcott only ventures to say that he "appears to allude to passages in St. Mark and St. John, but they are all anonymous."[5] The passages in which he speaks of the Logos, which are those referred to here, are certainly not taken from the fourth Gospel, and his doctrine is expressed in terminology which is different from that of the Gospel, and is deeply tinged with Platonism. He appeals to Proverbs viii. 22, already so frequently quoted by us, for confirmation by the Prophetic Spirit of his exposition of the Logos doctrine.[6] He nowhere identifies the Logos with Jesus; indeed, he does not once make use of the name of Christ in his works. He does not show the slightest knowledge of the doctrine of salvation so constantly enunciated in the fourth Gospel. There can be no doubt, as we have already shown,[7] that he considered the Old Testament to be the only inspired Holy Scriptures. Not only does he not mention or quote any of our Gospels, but the only instance in which he makes any reference to sayings of Jesus otherwise than by the indefinite *φησί*, "he says," is one in which he introduces a saying which is not found in our Gospels by the words: "The Logos again saying to us:" (*πάλιν ἡμῖν λέγοντος τοῦ Λόγου*), etc. From the same source, which was obviously not our canonical Gospels, we have, therefore, reason to conclude that Athenagoras derived his knowledge of Gospel history and doctrine. We need not add that this writer affords no testimony as to the origin or character of the fourth Gospel.

It is scarcely worth while to refer to the Epistle of Vienne and Lyons, a composition dating at the earliest A.D. 177–178, in which no direct reference is made to any writing of the New Testament.[8] Acquaintance with the fourth Gospel is argued from the following passage:

[1] P. 381 f. [2] P. 387 f. [3] P 395 f.
[4] P. 398 f. [5] *On the Canon*, p. 103.
[6] *Leg. pro Christ.*, § 10. [7] P. 404. [8] P. 404 f

Epistle, § iv.	John xvi. 2.
And thus was fulfilled the saying of our Lord :	
The time shall come in which every one that killeth you shall think that he offereth a service unto God.	But the hour cometh that every one that killeth you may think that he offereth a service unto God.
Ἐλεύσεται καιρὸς ἐν ᾧ πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας ὑμᾶς, δόξει λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ.	ἀλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα ἵνα πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας ὑμᾶς δόξῃ λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ.

Such a passage cannot prove the use of the fourth Gospel. No source is indicated in the Epistle from which the saying of Jesus, which, of course, apologists assert to be historical, was derived. It presents decided variations from the parallel in the fourth Gospel; and in the Synoptics we find sufficient indications of similar discourses[1] to render it very probable that other Gospels may have contained the passage quoted in the Epistle. In no case could an anonymous reference like this be of any weight as evidence for the Apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel.

We need not further discuss Ptolemæus and Heracleon. We have shown[2] that the date at which these heretics flourished places them beyond the limits within which we propose to confine ourselves. In regard to Ptolemæus, all that is affirmed is that, in the Epistle to Flora ascribed to him, expressions found in John i. 3 are used. The passage as it is given by Epiphanius is as follows: "Besides, that the world was created by the same, the Apostle states (saying all things have been made (γεγονέναι) by him and without him nothing was made)" (Ἔτι γε τὴν τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργίαν ἰδίαν λέγει εἶναι (ἅτε πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γεγονέναι, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέγονεν οὐδέν) ὁ ἀπόστολος).[3] Now, the supposed quotation is introduced here in a parenthesis interrupting the sense, and there is every probability that it was added as an illustration by Epiphanius, and was not in the Epistle to Flora at all. Omitting the parenthesis, the sentence is a very palpable reference to the Apostle Paul and Coloss. i. 16. In regard to Heracleon, it is asserted, from the unsupported references of Origen,[4] that he wrote a commentary on the fourth Gospel. Even if this be a fact, there is not a single word of it preserved by Origen which in the least degree bears upon the apostolic origin and trustworthiness of the Gospel. Neither of these heresiarchs, therefore, is of any value as a witness for the authenticity of the fourth Gospel.

The heathen Celsus, as we have shown,[5] wrote at a period when no evidence which he could well give of his own could have been

[1] Matt. x. 16–22, xxiv. 9 f.; Mark xiii. 9–13; Luke xxi. 12–17.
[2] P. 408 f.
[3] Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxxiii., § 3.
[4] The passages are quoted by Grabe (*Spicil. Patr.*, ii., p. 85 f.).
[5] P. 422 f.

of much value in supporting our Gospels. He is pressed into service,[1] however, because, after alluding to various circumstances of Gospel history, he says: "These things, therefore, being taken out of your own writings, we have no need of other testimony, for you fall upon your own swords";[2] and in another place he says that certain Christians "alter the Gospel from its first written form in three-fold, four-fold, and many-fold ways, and remould it in order to have the means of contradicting the arguments (of opponents)."[3] This is supposed to refer to the four canonical Gospels. Apart from the fact that Origen replies to the first of these passages that Celsus has brought forward much concerning Jesus which is not in accordance with the narratives of the Gospel, it is unreasonable to limit the accusation of "many-fold" corruption to four Gospels, when it is undeniable that the Gospels and writings long current in the Church were very numerous. In any case, what could such a statement as this do towards establishing the Apostolic origin and credibility of the fourth Gospel?

We might pass over the *Canon of Muratori* entirely as being beyond the limit of time to which we confine ourselves,[4] but the unknown writer of the fragment gives a legend with regard to the composition of the fourth Gospel which we may quote here, although its obviously mythical character renders it of no value as evidence regarding the authorship of the Gospel. The writer says:—

> Quarti euangeliorum Iohannis ex decipolis
> Cohortantibus condescipulis et episcopis suis
> dixit conieiunate mihi hodie triduo et quid
> cuique fuerit reuelatum alterutrum
> nobis ennarremus eadem nocte reue
> latum Andreæ ex apostolis ut recognis
> centibus cunctis Iohannis suo nomine
> cuncta describeret et ideo[5] licit uaria sin
> culis euangeliorum libris principia
> doceantur nihil tamen differt creden
> tium fidei cum uno ac principali spiritu de
> clarata sint in omnibus omnia de natiui
> tate de passione de resurrectione
> de conuersatione cum decipulis suis
> ac de gemino eius aduentu
> primo in humilitate dispectus quod fo.....
> it[6] secundum potestate regali.....pre

[1] Cf. Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 71 f.; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 356.

[2] Origen, *Contra Cels.*, ii. 47. [3] *Ib.*, ii. 27. [4] P. 481 f.

[5] It is admitted that the whole passage from this point to "*futurum est*" is abrupt and without connection with the context, as well as most confused. Cf. Tragelles, *Can. Murat.*, p. 36; Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 205.

[6] Credner reads here: "*quod ratum est*" (*Zur Gesch. d. Kan.*, p. 74). Dr. Westcott reads: "*quod fuit*" (*On the Canon*, p. 478).

clarum quod futurum est[1] quid ergo
mirum si Iohannes tam constanter
sincula etiam in epistulis suis proferat
dicens in semeipsu quæ uidimus oculis
nostris et auribus audiuimus et manus
nostræ palpauerunt hæc scripsimus uobis
sic enim non solum uisurem sed et auditorem
sed et scriptorem omnium mirabilium domini per ordi
nem profetetur

"The fourth of the Gospels, of John, one of the disciples. To his fellow disciples and bishops (Episcopis) urging him he said: 'Fast with me to-day for three days, and let us relate to each other that which shall be revealed to each.' On the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the Apostles, that, with the the supervision of all, John should relate all things in his own name. And, therefore, though various principles (principia) are taught by each book of the Gospels, nevertheless it makes no difference to the faith of believers, since, in all, all things are declared by one ruling Spirit concerning the nativity, concerning the passion, concerning the resurrection, concerning the intercourse with the disciples, and concerning his double advent; the first in lowliness of estate, which has taken place, the second in regal power and splendour, which is still future. What wonder, therefore, if John should so constantly bring forward each thing (singula) also in his Epistles, saying in regard to himself: The things which we have seen with our eyes, and have heard with our ears, and our hands have handled, these things have we written unto you. For thus he professes himself not only an eye-witness and hearer, but also a writer of all the wonders of the Lord in order."

It is obvious that in this passage we have an apologetic defence of the fourth Gospel, which unmistakably implies antecedent denial of its authority and Apostolic origin. The writer not only ascribes it to John, but he clothes it with the united authority of the rest of the Apostles, in a manner which very possibly aims at explaining the supplementary chapter xxi., with its testimony to the truth of the preceding narrative. In his zeal, the writer goes so far as to falsify a passage of the Epistle, and convert it into a declaration by the author of the letter himself that he had written the Gospel. "'The things which we have seen, etc., these things have we written unto you' *(hæc scripsimus vobis)*.[2] For thus he

[1] Dr. Tregelles calls attention to the resemblance of this passage to one of Tertullian (*Apol.*, § 21): "*Duobus enim adventibus eius significatis, primo, qui iam expunctus est in humilitate conditionis humanæ; secundo, qui concludendo seculo imminet in sublimitate divinitatis exserta: primum non intelligendo, secundum, quem manifestius prædicatum sperant unum existimaverunt*" (*Can. Murat.*, p. 36). This is another reason for dating the fragment in the third century.

[2] 1 John i. 1–3.

professes himself not only an eye-witness and hearer, but also a writer of all the wonders of the Lord in order." Credner argues that in speaking of John as "one of the disciples" (*ex discipulis*), and of Andrew as "one of the Apostles," the writer intends to distinguish between John the disciple, who wrote the Gospel and Epistle, and John the Apostle, who wrote the Apocalypse, and that it was for this reason that he sought to dignify him by a special revelation, through the Apostle Andrew, selecting him to write the Gospel. Credner, therefore, concludes that here we have an ancient ecclesiastical tradition ascribing the Gospel and first Epistle to one of the disciples of Jesus different from the Apostle John.[1] Into this we need not enter, nor is it necessary for us to demonstrate the mythical nature of the narrative regarding the origin of the Gospel. We have merely given this extract to make our statement regarding it complete. Not only is the evidence of the fragment of no value, from the lateness of its date and the uncritical character of its author, but a vague and fabulous tradition recorded by an unknown writer could not, in any case, furnish testimony calculated to establish the Apostolic origin and trustworthiness of the fourth Gospel.

[1] Credner, *Gesch. N. T. Kan.*, p. 158 f.; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1857, p. 301.

CHAPTER II.

AUTHORSHIP AND CHARACTER OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

The result of our inquiry into the evidence for the fourth Gospel is sufficiently decided to render further examination unnecessary. We have seen that, for a century and a half after the events recorded in the work, there is not only no testimony connecting the fourth Gospel with the Apostle John, but no certain trace even of the existence of the Gospel. There has not been the slightest evidence in any of the writings of the Fathers which we have examined even of a tradition that the Apostle John had composed any evangelical work at all, and the claim advanced in favour of the Christian miracles to contemporaneous evidence of extraordinary force and veracity by undoubted eye-witnesses so completely falls to the ground that we might here well bring this part of our inquiry to a close. There are, however, so many peculiar circumstances connected with the fourth Gospel, both in regard to its authorship and to its relationship to the three Synoptics, which invite further attention, that we propose briefly to review some of them. We must carefully restrict ourselves to the limits of our inquiry, and resist any temptation to enter upon an exhaustive discussion of the problem presented by the fourth Gospel from a more general literary point of view.

The endeavour to obtain some positive, or at least negative, information regarding the author of the fourth Gospel is facilitated by the fact that several other works in the New Testament Canon are ascribed to him. These works present such marked and distinct characteristics that, apart from the fact that their number extends the range of evidence, they afford an unusual opportunity of testing the tradition which assigns them all to the Apostle John, by comparing the clear indications which they give of the idiosyncrasies of their author with the independent data which we possess regarding the history and character of the Apostle. It is asserted by the Church that John the son of Zebedee, one of the disciples of Jesus, is the composer of no less than five of our canonical writings, and it would be impossible to select any books of our New Testament presenting more distinct features, or more widely divergent views, than are to be found in the Apocalypse on the one hand, and the Gospel and three Epistles on the other. Whilst a strong family likeness exists between the Epistles and the

Gospel, and they exhibit close analogies both in thought and language, the Apocalypse, on the contrary, is so different from them in language, in style, in religious views and terminology, that it is almost impossible to believe that the writer of the one could be the author of the other. The translators of our New Testament have laboured, and not in vain, to eliminate as far as possible all individuality of style and language, and to reduce the various books of which it is composed to one uniform smoothness of diction. It is, therefore, impossible for the mere English reader to appreciate the immense difference which exists between the harsh and Hebraistic Greek of the Apocalypse and the polished elegance of the fourth Gospel, and it is to be feared that the rarity of critical study has prevented any general recognition of the almost equally striking contrast of thought between the two works. The remarkable peculiarities which distinguish the Apocalypse and Gospel of John, however, were very early appreciated, and almost the first application of critical judgment to the canonical books of the New Testament is the argument of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, about the middle of the third century, that the author of the fourth Gospel could not be the writer of the Book of Revelation.[1] The dogmatic predilections which at that time had begun to turn against the Apocalypse, the non-fulfilment of the prophecies of which disappointed and puzzled the early Church, led Dionysius to solve the difficulty by deciding in favour of the authenticity of the Gospel; but at least he recognised the dilemma which has since occupied so much of Biblical criticism.

It is not necessary to enter upon any exhaustive analysis of the Apocalypse and Gospel to demonstrate anew that both works cannot have emanated from the same mind. This has already been conclusively done by others. Some apologetic writers - greatly influenced, no doubt, by the express declaration of the Church, and satisfied by analogies which could scarcely fail to exist between two works dealing with a similar theme—together with a very few independent critics, have asserted the authenticity of both works. The great majority of critics, however, have fully admitted the impossibility of recognising a common source for the fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse of John. The critical question regarding the two works has, in fact, reduced itself to the dilemma which may be expressed as follows, in the words of Lücke: "Either the Gospel and the first Epistle are genuine writings of the Apostle John, and, in that case, the Apocalypse is no genuine work of that Apostle, or the inverse."[2] After an elaborate

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, vii. 25.

[2] *Einl. Offenb. Johannes*, ii., p. 504.

comparison of the two works, the same writer, who certainly will not be suspected of wilfully subversive criticism, resumes: "The difference between the language, way of expression, and mode of thought and doctrine of the Apocalypse and the rest of the Johannine writings, is so comprehensive and intense, so individual and so radical; the affinity and agreement, on the contrary, are so vague, and in details so fragmentary and uncertain (*zurückweichend*), that the Apostle John, if he really be the author of the Gospel and of the Epistle—which we here assume—cannot have composed the Apocalypse either *before* or *after* the Gospel and the Epistle. If all critical experience and rules in such literary questions are not deceptive, it is certain that the Evangelist and Apocalyptist are two different persons of the name of John,"[1] etc.

De Wette, another conservative critic, speaks with equal decision. After an able comparison of the two works, he says: "From all this it follows (and in New Testament criticism no result is more certain) that the Apostle John, if he be the author of the fourth Gospel and of the Johannine Epistles, did not write the Apocalypse; or, if the Apocalypse be his work, that he is not the author of the other writings."[2] Ewald is equally positive: "Above all" he says, "we should err in tracing this work (the Gospel) to th'e Apostle if the Apocalypse of the New Testament were by him. That this much earlier writing cannot have been composed by the author of the latter is an axiom which I consider I have already (in 1826-28) so convincingly demonstrated that it would be superfluous now to return to it, especially as, since then, all men capable of forming a judgment are of the same opinion, and what has been brought forward by a few writers against it too clearly depends upon influences foreign to science."[3] We may, therefore, consider the point generally admitted, and proceed, very briefly, to discuss the question upon this basis.

The external evidence that the Apostle John wrote the Apocalypse is more ancient than that for the authorship of any book of the New Testament, excepting some of the Epistles of Paul, and this is admitted even by critics who ultimately deny the authenticity of the work. Passing over the very probable statement of Andrew of Cæsarea,[4] that Papias recognised the Apocalypse as an inspired work, and the inference drawn from this fact that he referred it to the Apostle, we at once proceed to Justin Martyr, who affirms in the clearest and most positive manner the Apostolic

[1] *Einl. Offenb. Joh.*, ii., p. 744 f. [2] *Einl. N. T.*, § 189 e., p. 422.
[3] *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, v., p. 179.
[4] It is generally asserted both by Apologists and others that this testimony is valid in favour of the recognition by Papias of the authenticity of the Apocalypse.

origin of the work. He speaks to Tryphon of "a certain man whose name was John, one of the Apostles of Christ, who prophesied by a revelation made to him," of the millennium and subsequent general resurrection and judgment.[1] The statement of Justin is all the more important from the fact that he does not name any other writing of the New Testament, and that the Old Testament was still for him the only Holy Scripture. The genuineness of this testimony is not called in question by any one. Eusebius states that Melito of Sardis wrote a work on the Apocalypse of John,[2] and Jerome mentions the treatise.[3] There can be no doubt that had Melito thrown the slightest doubt on the Apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, Eusebius, whose dogmatic views led him to depreciate that writing, would have referred to the fact. Eusebius also mentions that Apollonius, a Presbyter of Ephesus, quoted the Apocalypse against the Montanists, and there is reason to suppose that he did so as an Apostolic work.[4] Eusebius further states that Theophilus of Antioch made use of testimony from the Apocalypse of John;[5] but although, as Eusebius does not mention anything to the contrary, it is probable that Theophilus really recognised the book to be by John the Apostle, the uncritical haste of Eusebius renders his vague statement of little value. We do not think it worth while to quote the evidence of later writers. Although Irenæus, who repeatedly assigns the Apocalypse to John, the disciple of the Lord,[6] is cited by Apologists as a very important witness, more especially from his intercourse with Polycarp, we do not attribute any value to his testimony, both from the late date at which he wrote and from the uncritical and credulous character of his mind. Although he appeals to the testimony of those "who saw John face to face" with regard to the number of the name of the Beast, his own utter ignorance of the interpretation shows how little information he can have derived from Polycarp.[7] The same remarks apply still more strongly to Tertullian, who most unhesitatingly assigns the Apocalypse to the Apostle John.[8] It would be useless more particularly to refer to later evidence, or quote even the decided testimony in its favour of Clement of Alexandria,[9] or Origen.[10]

The first doubt cast upon the authenticity of the Apocalypse occurs in the argument of Dionysius of Alexandria, one of the disciples of Origen, in the middle of the third century. He mentions that some had objected to the whole work as without sense

[1] *Dial.* 81; cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 18. [2] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 26.
[3] *De Vir. Ill.*, 24. [4] Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 18.
[5] *Ib.*, iv. 24. [6] *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 20, § 11; 21, § 3; 30, § 4, etc.
[7] *Ib.*, v. 30. [8] *Adv. Marc.*, iii. 14, 24, etc. [9] *Stromata*, vi. 13, §§ 106, 141.
[10] Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi. 25, in *Joann. Opp.*, iv., p. 17.

or reason, and as displaying such dense ignorance that it was impossible that an Apostle, or even one in the Church, could have written it, and they assigned it to Cerinthus, who held the doctrine of the reign of Christ on earth.[1] These objections, it is obvious, are merely dogmatic, and do not affect to be historical. They are, in fact, a good illustration of the method by which the Canon was formed. If the doctrine of any writing met with the approval of the early Church, it was accepted with unhesitating faith, and its pretension to Apostolic origin was admitted as a natural consequence; but if, on the other hand, the doctrine of the writing was not clearly that of the community, it was rejected without further examination. It is an undeniable fact that not a single trace exists of the application of historical criticism to any book of the New Testament in the early ages of Christianity. The case of the Apocalypse is most intelligible:—So long as the expectation and hope of a second advent and of a personal reign of the risen and glorified Christ, of the prevalence of which we have abundant testimony in the Pauline Epistles and other early works, continued to animate the Church, the Apocalypse which excited and fostered them was a popular volume; but as years passed away and the general longing of Christians, eagerly marking the signs of the times, was again and again disappointed, and the hope of a millennium began either to be abandoned or indefinitely postponed, the Apocalypse proportionately lost favour, or was regarded as an incomprehensible book misleading the world by illusory promises. Its history is that of a highly dogmatic treatise esteemed or contemned in proportion to the ebb and flow of opinion regarding the doctrines which it expresses.

The objections of Dionysius, resting first upon dogmatic grounds and his inability to understand the Apocalyptic utterances of the book, took the shape we have mentioned of a critical dilemma:—The author of the Gospel could not at the same time be the author of the Apocalypse. Dogmatic predilection decided the question in favour of the apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel, and the reasoning by which that decision is arrived at has, therefore, no critical force or value. The fact still remains that Justin Martyr distinctly refers to the Apocalypse as the work of the Apostle John, and no similar testimony exists in support of the claims of the fourth Gospel.

As another most important point, we may mention that there is probably not another work of the New Testament the precise date of the composition of which, within a very few weeks, can so positively be affirmed. No result of criticism rests upon a more secure basis and is now more universally accepted by all competent

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, vii. 24.

critics than the fact that the Apocalypse was written in A.D. 68–69. The writer distinctly and repeatedly mentions his name: i. 1, "The revelation of Jesus Christ.....unto his servant John"; i. 4, "John to the seven churches which are in Asia";[1] and he states that the work was written in the island of Patmos, where he was "on account of the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus."[2] Ewald, who decides in the most arbitrary manner against the authenticity of the Apocalypse and in favour of the Johannine authorship of the Gospel, objects that the author, although he certainly calls himself John, does not assume to be an Apostle, but merely terms himself the servant (δοῦλος) of Christ like other true Christians, and distinctly classes himself among the Prophets,[3] and not among the Apostles.[4] We find, however, that Paul, who was not apt to waive his claims to the Apostolate, was content to call himself "Paul, a servant (δοῦλος) of Jesus Christ, called to be an Apostle," in writing to the Romans; (i. 1) and the superscription of the Epistle to the Philippians is: "Paul and Timothy, servants (δοῦλοι) of Christ Jesus."[5] There was, moreover, reason why the author of the Book of Revelation, a work the form of which was decidedly based upon that of Daniel and other Jewish Apocalytic writings, should rather adopt the character of Prophet than the less suitable designation of Apostle upon such an occasion. It is clear that he counted fully upon being generally known under the simple designation of "John," and when we consider the unmistakable terms of authority with which he addresses the Seven Churches it is scarcely possible to deny that the writer either was the Apostle or distinctly desired to assume his personality. It is not necessary for us here to enter into any discussion regarding the "Presbyter John," for it is generally admitted that even he could not have had at that time any position in Asia Minor which could have warranted such a tone. If the name of Apostle, therefore, be not directly assumed—and it was not necessary to assume it—the authority of one is undeniably inferred.

Ewald argues that, on the contrary, the author could not more clearly express that he was not one of the Twelve than when he imagines (*Apoc.*, xxi. 14) the names of the "twelve apostles of the Lamb" shining upon the twelve foundation-stones of the wall of the future heavenly Jerusalem. He considers that no intelligent person could thus publicly glorify himself or

[1] Cf. i. 9; xxii. 8. [2] i. 9, διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ.....

[3] Cf. i. 1–3, 9 f.; xix. 9 f.; xxii. 6–9, 10, 16 f., 18 f.

[4] Ewald, *Die Joh. Schr.*, ii., p. 55 f.; *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, v., p. 179 f.

[5] We do not refer to the opening of the Epistle to Titus, nor to that which commences "James, a servant (δοῦλος) of God," etc., nor to the so-called "Epistle of Jude," all being too much disputed or apocryphal.

anticipate the honour which God alone can bestow. "Can any one seriously believe," he indignantly inquires, "that one of the Twelve, yea, that even he whom we know as the most delicate and refined amongst them, could have written this of himself?"[1] In the first place, we must remark that in this discussion it is not permissible to speak of our knowing John the Apostle as distinguished above all the rest of the Twelve for such qualities. Nowhere do we find such a representation of him except in the fourth Gospel, if even there, but, as we shall presently see, rather the contrary, and the fourth Gospel cannot here be received as evidence. We might point out that the symbolical representation of the heavenly Jerusalem is held to be practically objective, a revelation of things that "must shortly come to pass," and not a mere subjective sketch coloured according to the phantasy of the writer. Passing on, however, it must be apparent that the whole account of the heavenly city is typical, and that in basing its walls upon the Twelve he does not glorify himself personally, but simply gives its place to the idea which was symbolised when Jesus is represented as selecting twelve disciples, the number of the twelve tribes, upon whose preaching the spiritual city was to be built. The Jewish belief in a special preference of the Jews before all nations doubtless suggested this, and it forms a leading feature in the strong Hebraistic form of the writer's Christianity. The heavenly city is simply a glorified Jerusalem; the twelve Apostles, representatives of the twelve tribes, set apart for the regeneration of Israel, are the foundation-stones of the New City with its twelve tribes of Israel,[2] for whom the city is more particularly provided. For 144,000 of Israel are first sealed, 12,000 of each of the twelve tribes, before the Seer beholds the great multitude of all nations and tribes and peoples.[3] The whole description is a mere allegory characterised by the strongest Jewish dogmatism, and it is of singular value for the purpose of identifying the author.

Moreover, the apparent glorification of the Twelve is more than justified by the promise which Jesus is represented by the Synoptics[4] as making to them in person. When Peter, in the name of the Twelve, asks what is reserved for those who have forsaken all and followed him, Jesus replies: "Verily I say unto you that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall be set upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."[5] Ewald himself, in his distribution of the materials of our existing

[1] *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, v., p. 180 f; cf. *Die. Joh. Schriften*, 1862, ii., p. 56 f.
[2] *Apoc.*, xxi. 12.
[3] *Ib.*, vii. 4–9.
[4] Matt. xix. 27, 28; Luke xii. 28–30.
[5] Matt. xix. 28.

first Synoptic to the supposed original sources, assigns this passage to the very oldest Gospel.[1] What impropriety is there, and what improbability, therefore, that an Apostle, in an apocalyptic allegory, should represent the names of the twelve Apostles as inscribed upon the twelve foundation-stones of the spiritual Jerusalem, as the names of the twelve tribes of Israel were inscribed upon the twelve gates of the city? On the contrary, it is probable under the circumstances that an Apostle should make such a representation, and, in view of the facts regarding the Apostle John himself which we have from the Synoptics, it is particularly in harmony with his character; and these characteristics directly tend to establish his identity with the author.

"How much less is it credible of the Apostle John," says Ewald elsewhere, pursuing the same argument, "who as a writer is so incomparably modest and delicate in feeling, and does not in a single one of the writings really emanating from him name himself as the author, or even proclaim his own praise."[2] This is merely sentimental assumption of facts, to which we shall hereafter allude; but, if the "incomparable modesty" of which he speaks really existed, nothing could more conclusively separate the author of the fourth Gospel from the son of Zebedee whom we know in the Synoptics, or more support the claims of the Apocalypse. In the first place, we must assert that, in writing a serious history of the life and teaching of Jesus, full of marvellous events and astounding doctrines, the omission of his name by an Apostle can not only not be recognised as genuine modesty, but must be condemned as culpable neglect. It is perfectly incredible that an Apostle could have written such a work without attaching his name as the guarantee of his intimate acquaintance with the events and statements he records. What would be thought of a historian who published a history without a single reference to recognised authorities, and yet who did not declare even his own name as some evidence of his truth? The fact is that the first two Synoptics bear no author's name because they are not the work of any one man, but the collected materials of many; the third Synoptic only pretends to be a compilation for private use; and the fourth Gospel bears no simple signature because it is neither the work of an Apostle, nor of an eye-witness of the events and hearer of the teaching it records.

If it be considered incredible that an Apostle could, even in an Allegory, represent the names of the Twelve as written on the foundation-stones of the New Jerusalem, and the incomparable modesty and delicacy of feeling of the assumed author of the fourth Gospel be contrasted with it so much to the disadvan-

[1] *Die drei ersten Evv.*, p. 23. [2] *Die Joh. Schr.*, ii., p. 56 f.

tage of the writer of the Apocalypse, we ask whether this reference to the collective Twelve can be considered at all on a par with the self-glorification of the disguised author of the Gospel, who, not content with the simple indication of himself as John, a servant of Jesus Christ, and sharing distinction equally with the rest of the Twelve, assumes to himself alone a pre-eminence in the favour and affection of his Master, as well as a distinction amongst his fellow disciples, of which we first hear from himself, and which is anything but corroborated by the three Synoptics? The supposed author of the fourth Gospel, it is true, does not plainly mention his name, but he distinguishes himself as "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and represents himself as "leaning on Jesus' breast at supper."[1] This distinction assumed for himself, and this preference over the other disciples in the love of him whom he represents as God, is much greater self-glorification than that of the author of the Apocalypse. We shall presently see how far Ewald is right in saying, moreover, that the author does not clearly indicate the person for whom, at least, he desires to be mistaken.

We must conclude that these objections have no weight, and that there is no internal evidence against the supposition that the "John" who announces himself as the author of the Apocalypse was the Apostle. On the contrary, the tone of authority adopted throughout, and the evident certainty that his identity would everywhere be recognised, denote a position in the Church which no other person of the name of John could well have held at the time when the Apocalypse was written. The external evidence, therefore, which indicates the Apostle John as the author of the Apocalypse is quite in harmony with the internal testimony of the book itself. We have already pointed out the strong colouring of Judaism in the views of the writer. Its imagery is thoroughly Jewish, and its allegorical representations are entirely based upon Jewish traditions and hopes. The heavenly City is a New Jerusalem; its twelve gates are dedicated to the twelve tribes of Israel; God and the Lamb are the Temple of it; and the sealed of the twelve tribes have the precedence over the nations, and stand with the Lamb on Mount Zion (xiv. 1) having his name and his Father's written on their foreheads. The language in which the book is written is the most Hebraistic Greek of the New Testament, as its contents are the most deeply tinged with Judaism. If, finally, we seek for some traces of the character of the writer, we see in every page the impress of an impetuous fiery spirit, whose symbol is the Eagle, breathing forth vengeance against the enemies of the Messiah and impatient till it

[1] John xiii. 23; xix. 26, 27; xx. 2 f.; cf. xxi. 20 f.

be accomplished, and the whole of the visions of the Apocalypse proceed to the accompaniment of the rolling thunders of God's wrath.

We may now turn to examine such historical data as exist regarding John the son of Zebedee, and to inquire whether they accord better with the character and opinions of the author of the Apocalypse or of the Evangelist. John and his brother James are represented by the Synoptics as being the sons of Zebedee and Salome. They were fishermen on the sea of Galilee, and at the call of Jesus they left their ship and their father and followed him.[1] Their fiery and impetuous character led Jesus to give them the surname of Βοανηργές, "Sons of thunder,"[2] an epithet justified by several incidents which are related regarding them. Upon one occasion, John sees one casting out devils in his master's name, and in an intolerant spirit forbids him because he did not follow them, for which he is rebuked by Jesus.[3] Another time, when the inhabitants of a Samaritan village would not receive them, John and James angrily turn to Jesus and say: "Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elijah did?"[4] A remarkable episode will have presented itself already to the mind of every reader, which the second synoptic Gospel narrates as follows:—Mark x. 35. "And James and John the sons of Zebedee come unto him saying unto him: Teacher, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall ask thee. 36. And he said unto them: What would ye that I should do for you? 37. They said unto him: Grant that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand in thy glory. 38. But Jesus said to them: Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink the cup that I drink? or be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with? 39. And they said unto him: We can. And Jesus said unto them: The cup that I drink ye shall drink; and with the baptism that I am baptised withal shall ye be baptised: 40. But to sit on my right hand or on my left hand is not mine to give, but for whom it has been prepared. 41. And when the ten heard it they began to be much displeased with James and John." It is difficult to say whether the effrontery and selfishness of the request, or the assurance with which the brethren assert their power to emulate the Master, is more striking in this scene. Apparently, the grossness of the proceeding already began to be felt when our first Gospel was edited, for it represents the request as made by the mother of James and John; but that is a very slight decrease of the offence, inasmuch as the brethren are obviously consenting, if not inciting, parties to the prayer, and

[1] Matt. iv. 21 f.; Mark i. 19 f.; Luke v. 19 f.
[2] Mark iii. 17. [3] *Ib.*, ix. 38 f.; Luke ix. 49 f. [4] Luke ix. 54 f.

utter their "We can" with the same absence of "incomparable modesty."[1] After the death of Jesus, John remained in Jerusalem,[2] and chiefly confined his ministry to the city and its neighbourhood.[3] The account which Hegesippus gives of James the brother of Jesus who was appointed overseer of the Church in Jerusalem will not be forgotten,[4] and we refer to it merely in illustration of primitive Christianity. However mythical elements are worked up into the narrative, one point is undoubted fact, that the Christians of that community were but a sect of Judaism, merely superadding to Mosaic doctrines belief in the actual advent of the Messiah whom Moses and the prophets had foretold; and we find, in the Acts of the Apostles, Peter and John represented as "going up into the Temple at the hour of prayer,"[5] like other Jews. In the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians we have most valuable evidence with regard to the Apostle John. Paul found him still in Jerusalem on the occasion of the visit referred to in that letter, about A.D. 50 53. We need not quote at length the important passage, Gal. ii. 1 f., but the fact is undeniable, and stands upon stronger evidence than almost any other particular regarding the early Church, being distinctly and directly stated by Paul himself: that the three "pillar" Apostles representing the Church there were James, Peter, and John. Peter is markedly termed the Apostle of the circumcision, and the differences between him and Paul are evidence of the opposition of their views. James and John are clearly represented as sharing the views of Peter, and, whilst Paul finally agrees with them that he is to go to the Gentiles, the three στῦλοι elect to continue their ministry to the circumcision.[6] Here is John, therefore, clearly devoted to the Apostleship of the circumcision as opposed to Paul, whose views, as we gather from the whole of Paul's account, were little more than tolerated by the στῦλοι. Before leaving New Testament data, we may here point out the statement in the Acts of the Apostles that Peter and John were known to be "unlettered and ignorant men"[7] (ἄνθρωποι ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται). Later tradition mentions one or two circumstances regarding John to which we may briefly refer. Irenæus states: "There are those who heard him (Polycarp) say that John, the disciple of the Lord, going to bathe at Ephesus and perceiving Cerinthus within, rushed forth from the bath-house without bathing, but crying out: 'Let us fly lest the bath-house fall down: Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, being within it.'.....So great was the care which the Apostles and their disciples took not to hold even verbal intercourse with

[1] Matt. xx. 20 f. [2] Acts i. 13; iii. 1. [3] *Ib.*, viii. 25; xv. 1 f.
[4] Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii. 23; cf. p. 268 f. [5] Acts iii. 1. f.
[6] Gal. ii. 8–9. [7] Acts iv. 13.

any of the corrupters of the truth,"[1] etc. Polycrates, who was Bishop of Ephesus about the beginning of the third century, states that the Apostle John wore the mitre and petalon of the high priest (ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορηκώς),[2] a tradition which agrees with the Jewish tendencies of the Apostle of the circumcision as Paul describes him.[3]

Now, if we compare these data regarding John the son of Zebedee with the character of John, the author of the Apocalypse, as we trace it in the work itself, it is impossible not to be struck by the singular agreement. The Hebraistic Greek and abrupt inelegant diction are natural to the unlettered fisherman of Galilee, and the fierce and intolerant spirit which pervades the book is precisely that which formerly forbade the working of miracles, even in the name of the Master, by any not of the immediate circle of Jesus, and which desired to consume an inhospitable village with fire from heaven.[4] The Judaistic form of Christianity which is represented throughout the Apocalypse, and the Jewish elements which enter so largely into its whole composition, are precisely those which we might expect from John the Apostle of the circumcision, and the associate of James and of Peter in the very centre of Judaism. Parts of the Apocalypse, indeed, derive a new significance when we remember the opposition which the Apostle of the Gentiles met with from the Apostles of the circumcision, as plainly declared by Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians ii. 1 f., and apparent in other parts of his writings.

We have already seen the scarcely disguised attack which is made on Paul in the *Clementine Homilies* under the name of Simon the Magician, the Apostle Peter following him from city to city for the purpose of denouncing and refuting his teaching. There can be no doubt that the animosity against Paul which was

[1] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 4; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 14.

[2] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 31.

[3] We need not refer to any of the other legends regarding John, but it may be well to mention the tradition common amongst the Fathers which assigned to him the cognomen of "the Virgin." One *Codex* gives as the superscription of the Apocalypse: "τοῦ ἁγίου ἐνδοξοτάτου ἀποστόλου καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ παρθένου ἠγαπημένου ἐπιστηθίου Ἰωάννου θεολόγου"; and we know that it is reported in early writings that, of all the Apostles, only John and the Apostle Paul remained unmarried; whence probably, in part, this title. In connection with this, we may point to the importance attached to virginity in the Apocalypse, xiv. 4; cf. Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, ii., p. 254; Lücke, *Comm. üb. d. Br. Joh.*, 1836, p. 32 f.; Credner, *Einl. N. T.*, i., p. 21.

[4] The very objection of Ewald regarding the glorification of the Twelve, if true, would be singularly in keeping with the audacious request of John and his brother, to sit on the right and left hand of the glorified Jesus, for we find none of the "incomparable modesty" which the imaginative critic attributes to the author of the fourth Gospel in the John of the Synoptics.

felt by the Ebionitic party, to which John as well as Peter belonged, was extreme, and when the novelty of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, taught by him, is considered, it is very comprehensible. In the Apocalypse we find undeniable traces of it which accord with what Paul himself says, and with the undoubted tradition of the early Church. Not only is Paul silently excluded from the number of the Apostles, which might be intelligible when the typical nature of the number twelve is considered, but allusion is undoubtedly made to him in the Epistles to the Churches. It is clear that Paul is referred to in the address to the Church of Ephesus: "And thou didst try them which say that they are Apostles and are not, and didst find them false";[1] and also in the words to the Church of Smyrna: "But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the teaching of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling block before the sons of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols,"[2] etc., as well as elsewhere. Without dwelling on this point, however, we think it must be apparent to every unprejudiced person that the Apocalypse singularly corresponds in every respect—language, construction, and thought—with what we are told of the character of the Apostle John by the Synoptic Gospels and by tradition, and that the internal evidence, therefore, accords with the external in attributing the composition of the Apocalypse to that Apostle. We may without hesitation affirm, at least, that with the exception of one or two of the Epistles of Paul there is no work of the New Testament which is supported by such close evidence.

We need not discuss the tradition as to the residence of the Apostle John in Asia Minor, regarding which much might be said. Those who accept the authenticity of the Apocalypse of course admit its composition in the neighbourhood of Ephesus,[3] and see in this the confirmation of the widespread tradition that the Apostle spent a considerable period of the latter part of his life in that city. We may merely mention, in passing, that a historical basis for the tradition has occasionally been disputed, and has latterly again been denied by some able critics. The evidence for this, as for everything else connected with the early ages of Christianity, is extremely unsatisfactory. Nor need we trouble ourselves with the dispute as to the Presbyter John, to whom many ascribe the composition, on the one hand, of the Apocalypse, and, on the other, of the Gospel, according as they finally accept the one or the other alternative of the critical dilemma which we have explained.

If we proceed to compare the character of the Apostle John, as we have it depicted in the Synoptics and other writings to which

[1] *Apoc.*, ii. 2. [2] *Ib.*, ii. 14, iii. 9. [3] *Ib.*, i. 9.

we have referred, with that of the author of the fourth Gospel, and to contrast the peculiarities of both, we have a very different result. Instead of the Hebraistic Greek and harsh diction which might be expected from the unlettered and ignorant fisherman of Galilee, we find, in the fourth Gospel, the purest and least Hebraistic Greek of any of the Gospels (some parts of the third Synoptic, perhaps, alone excepted), and a refinement and beauty of composition whose charm has captivated the world, and in too many cases prevented the calm exercise of judgment. Instead of the fierce and intolerant temper of the Son of thunder, we find a spirit breathing forth nothing but gentleness and love. Instead of the Judaistic Christianity of the Apostle of Circumcision who merely tolerates Paul, we find a mind which has so completely detached itself from Judaism that the writer makes the very appellation of "Jew" equivalent to that of an enemy of the truth. Not only are the customs and feasts of the Jews disregarded and spoken of as observances of a people with whom the writer has no concern, but he anticipates the day when neither on Mount Gerizim nor yet at Jerusalem men shall worship the Father, but when it shall be recognised that the only true worship is that which is offered in spirit and in truth. Faith in Jesus Christ and the merits of his death is the only way by which man can attain to eternal life, and the Mosaic Law is practically abolished. We venture to assert that, taking the portrait of John the son of Zebedee, which is drawn in the Synoptics and the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, supplemented by later tradition, to which we have referred, and comparing it with that of the writer of the fourth Gospel, no unprejudiced mind can fail to recognise that there are not two features alike.

It is the misfortune of this case that the beauty of the Gospel under trial has too frequently influenced the decision of the judges, and men who have, in other matters, exhibited sound critical judgment, in this abandon themselves to sheer sentimentality, and indulge in rhapsodies when reasons would be more appropriate. Bearing in mind that we have given the whole of the data regarding John the son of Zebedee furnished by New Testament writings -excluding merely the fourth Gospel itself, which, of course, cannot at present be received in evidence as well as the only traditional information possessing, from its date and character, any appreciable value, it will become apparent that every argument which proceeds on the assumption that John was the beloved disciple, and possessed of characteristics quite different from those we meet with in the writings to which we have referred, is worthless and a mere *petitio principii*. We can, therefore, appreciate the state of the case when, for instance, we find an able man like Credner commencing his inquiry as to who

was the author of the fourth Gospel with such words as the following: "Were we entirely without historical data regarding the author of the fourth Gospel, who is not named in the writing itself, we should still, from internal grounds in the Gospel itself—from the nature of the language, from the freshness and perspicacity of the narrative, from the exactness and precision of the statements, from the peculiar manner of the mention of the Baptist and of the sons of Zebedee, from the love and fervour rising to ecstasy which the writer manifests towards Jesus, from the irresistible charm which is poured out over the whole ideally-composed evangelical history, from the philosophical considerations with which the Gospel begins—be led to the result: that the author of such a Gospel can only be a native of Palestine, can only be a direct eye-witness, can only be an Apostle, can only be a favourite of Jesus, can only be that John whom Jesus held captivated to himself by the whole heavenly spell of his teaching, that John who rested on the bosom of Jesus, stood beneath his cross, and whose later residence in a city like Ephesus proves that philosophical speculation not merely attracted him, but that he also knew how to maintain his place amongst philosophically cultivated Greeks."[1] It is almost impossible to proceed further in building up theory on baseless assumption; but we shall hereafter see that he is kept in countenance by Ewald, who outstrips him in the boldness and minuteness of his conjectures. We must now more carefully examine the details of the case.

The language in which the Gospel is written, as we have already mentioned, is much less Hebraic than that of the other Gospels, with the exception of parts of the Gospel according to Luke, and its Hebraisms are not on the whole greater than was almost invariably the case with Hellenistic Greek; but its composition is distinguished by peculiar smoothness, grace, and beauty, and in this respect it is assigned the first rank among the Gospels. It may be remarked that the connection which Credner finds between the language and the Apostle John arises out of the supposition that long residence in Ephesus had enabled him to acquire that facility of composition in the Greek language which is one of its characteristics. Ewald, who exaggerates the Hebraism of the work, resorts nevertheless to the conjecture, which we shall hereafter more fully consider, that the Gospel was written from dictation by young friends of John in Ephesus, who put the aged Apostle's thoughts, in many places, into purer Greek as they wrote them down.[2] The arbitrary nature of such an explanation, adopted in one shape or another by many apologists,

[1] Credner, *Einl. N. T.*, i., p. 208. [2] *Die Joh. Schr.*, i. p. 50 f.

requires no remark; but we shall at every turn meet with similar assumptions advanced to overcome difficulties. Now, although there is no certain information as to the time when, if ever, the Apostle removed into Asia Minor, it is at least pretty certain that he did not leave Palestine before A.D. 60.[1] We find him still at Jerusalem about A.D. 50–53, when Paul went thither, and he had not at that time any intention of leaving; but, on the contrary, his dedication of himself to the ministry of the circumcision is distinctly mentioned by the Apostle.[2] The "unlettered and ignorant" fisherman of Galilee, therefore, had obviously attained an age when habits of thought and expression have become fixed, and when a new language cannot without great difficulty be acquired. If we consider the Apocalypse to be his work, we find positive evidence of such markedly different thought and language actually existing when the Apostle must have been between sixty and seventy years of age, that it is quite impossible to conceive that he could have subsequently acquired the language and mental characteristics of the fourth Gospel. It would be perfectly absurd, so far as language goes, to find in the fourth Gospel the slightest indication of the Apostle John, of whose language we have no information except from the Apocalypse, a composition which, if accepted as written by the Apostle, would at once exclude all consideration of the Gospel as his work.

There are many circumstances, however, which seem clearly to indicate that the author of the fourth Gospel was neither a native of Palestine nor a Jew, and to some of these we must briefly refer. The philosophical statements with which the Gospel commences, it will be admitted, are anything but characteristic of the Son of thunder, the ignorant and unlearned fisherman of Galilee who, to a comparatively advanced period of life, continued preaching in his native country to his brethren of the circumcision. Attempts have been made to trace the Logos doctrine of the fourth Gospel to the purely Hebraic source of the Old Testament, but every impartial mind must perceive that here there is no direct and simple transformation of the theory of Wisdom of the Proverbs and Old Testament Apocrypha, and no mere development of the later Memra of the Targums, but a very advanced application to Christianity of Alexandrian philosophy, with which we have become familiar through the writings of Philo, to which reference has so frequently been made. It is quite true that a decided step beyond the doctrine of Philo is made when the Logos is

[1] It is almost certain that John did not remove to Asia Minor during Paul's time. There is no trace of his being there in the Pauline Epistles (cf. de Wette, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 221).

[2] Gal. ii. 9.

represented as σὰρξ ἐγένετο in the person of Jesus; but this argument is equally applicable to the Jewish doctrine of Wisdom, and that step had already been taken before the composition of the Gospel. In the Alexandrian philosophy everything was prepared for the final application of the doctrine, and nothing is more clear than the fact that the writer of the fourth Gospel was well acquainted with the teaching of the Alexandrian school, from which he derived his philosophy, and its elaborate and systematic application to Jesus alone indicates a late development of Christian doctrine, which we maintain could not have been attained by the Judaistic son of Zebedee.[1]

We have already on several occasions referred to the attitude which the writer of the fourth Gospel assumes towards the Jews. Apart from the fact that he places Christianity generally in strong antagonism to Judaism, as light to darkness, truth to a lie, and presents the doctrine of a hypostatic Trinity in the most developed form to be found in the New Testament, in striking contrast to the three Synoptics, and in contradiction to Hebrew Monotheism, he writes at all times as one who not only is not a Jew himself, but has nothing to do with their laws and customs. He speaks everywhere of the feasts "of the Jews," "the passover of the Jews," "the manner of the purifying of the Jews," "the Jews' feast of tabernacles," "as the manner of the Jews is to bury," "the Jews' preparation day," and so on.[2] The Law of Moses is spoken of as "your law," "their law," as of a people with which the writer was not connected.[3] Moreover, the Jews are represented as continually in virulent opposition to Jesus, and seeking to kill him; and the word "Jew" is the unfailing indication of the enemies of the truth, and the persecutors of the Christ.[4] The Jews are not once spoken of as the favoured people of God, but they are denounced as "children of the devil," who is "the father of lies and a murderer from the beginning."[5] The author makes Caiaphas and the chief priests and Pharisees speak of the Jewish people not as ὁ λαός, but as τὸ ἔθνος, the term employed by the Jews to designate the Gentiles.[6] We need scarcely point out that the Jesus of the fourth

[1] Most critics agree that the characteristics of the fourth Gospel render the supposition that it was the work of an old man untenable.

[2] John ii. 6, 13; v. 1; vi. 4; vii. 2; xix. 40, 42, etc.

[3] *Ib.*, viii. 17; x. 34; xv. 25, etc.

[4] *Ib.*, v. 16, 18; vii. 23, 19 f.; viii. 40, 59; ix. 22, 28; xviii. 31 f.; xix. 12 f.

[5] *Ib.*, viii. 44.

[6] τὸ ἔθνος is applied to the Jewish people fourteen times in the New Testament. It is so used five times in the fourth Gospel (xi. 48, 50, 51, 52, xviii. 35), and elsewhere, with one exception, only by the author of the third Synoptic and Acts (Luke vii. 5, xxiii. 2; Acts x. 22, xxiv. 3, 10, 17, xxvi. 4, xxviii. 19), who is almost universally believed to have been a Gentile convert and not a

Gospel is no longer of the race of David, but the Son of God. The expectation of the Jews that the Messiah should be of the seed of David is entirely set aside, and the genealogies of the first and third Synoptics tracing his descent are not only ignored, but the whole idea absolutely excluded.

Then the writer calls Annas the high priest, although at the same time Caiaphas is represented as holding that office.[1] The expression which he uses is: "Caiaphas being the high priest that year" (ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου). This statement, made more than once, indicates the belief that the office was merely annual, which is erroneous. Josephus states with regard to Caiaphas that he was high priest for ten years, from A.D. 25–36.[2] Ewald and others argue that the expression "that year" refers to the year in which the death of Jesus, so memorable to the writer, took place, and that it does not exclude the possibility of his having been high priest for successive years also.[3] This explanation, however, is quite arbitrary and insufficient, and this is shown by the additional error in representing Annas as also high priest at the same time. The Synoptists know nothing of the preliminary examination before Annas, and the reason given by the writer of the fourth Gospel why the soldiers first took Jesus to Annas: "for he was father-in-law to Caiaphas, who was high priest that same year,"[4] is inadmissible. The assertion is a clear mistake, and it probably originated in a stranger, writing of facts and institutions with which he was not well acquainted, being misled by an error equally committed by the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles. In Luke iii. 2 the word of God is said to come to John the Baptist, "in the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas" (ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἄννα καὶ Καϊάφα); and again, in Acts iv. 6, Annas is spoken of as the high priest when Peter and John healed the lame man at the gate of the Temple which was called "Beautiful," and Caiaphas is mentioned immediately after: "And Annas the high priest, and Caiaphas, and John, and Alex-

Jew. The exception referred to is 1 Pet. ii. 9, where, however, the use is justified: ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν. The word λαός is only twice used in the fourth Gospel, once in xi. 50, where ἔθνος occurs in the same verse, and again in xviii. 14, where the same words of Caiaphas, xi. 50, are quoted. It is found in viii. 2, but that episode does not belong to the fourth Gospel, but is probably taken from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Ewald himself points out that the saying of Caiaphas is the purest Greek, and this is another proof that it could not proceed from the son of Zebedee. It could still less be, as it stands, an original speech in Greek of the high priest to the Jewish Council — a point which does not require remark (cf. Ewald, *Die Joh. Schr.*, i., p. 325, anm. 1).

[1] John xi. 49, 51; xviii. 13, 16, 19, 22, 24.

[2] *Antiq.* xviii. 2, § 2; 4, § 3; cf. Matt. xxvi. 3, 57.

[3] *Die Joh. Schr.*, i., p. 326, anm. 1; Lücke, *Comment. Ev. Joh.*, ii., p. 484.

[4] John xviii. 13.

ander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest." Such statements, erroneous in themselves and not understood by the author of the fourth Gospel, may have led to the confusion in the narrative. Annas had previously been high priest, as we know from Josephus,[1] but nothing is more certain than the fact that the title was not continued after the office was resigned; and Ishmael, Eleazar, and Simon, who succeeded Annas and separated his term of office from that of Caiaphas, did not subsequently bear the title. The narrative is a mistake, and such an error could not have been committed by a native of Palestine, and much less by an acquaintance of the high priest.[2]

There are also several geographical errors committed which denote a foreigner. In i. 28 the writer speaks of a "Bethany beyond Jordan, where John was baptising." The substitution of "Bethabara," mentioned by Origen, which has erroneously crept into the vulgar text, is, of course, repudiated by critics, "Bethany" standing in all the older codices. The alteration was evidently proposed to obviate the difficulty that, even in Origen's time, there did not exist any trace of a Bethany beyond Jordan in Peræa. The place could not be the Bethany near Jerusalem, and it is supposed that the writer either mistook its position or, inventing a second Bethany, which he described as "beyond Jordan," displayed an ignorance of the locality improbable either in a Jew or a Palestinian.[3] Again, in iii. 23, the writer says that "John was

[1] *Antiq.*, xviii. 2, § 1.

[2] John xviii. 15. The author says, in relating the case of restoration of sight to a blind man, that Jesus desired him: (ix. 7) "Go wash in the pool of Siloam," and adds: "which is by interpretation: Sent." The writer evidently wishes to ascribe a prophetical character to the name, and thus increase the significance of the miracle; but the explanation of the Hebrew name, it is contended, is forced and incorrect (Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, p. 93; Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii., p. 428; cf. Gesenius, *Lex. Hebr.*, 1847, p. 925), and betrays a superficial knowledge of the language. At the best, the interpretation is a mere conceit, and Lücke (*Ev. Joh.*, ii., p. 381) refuses to be persuaded that the parenthesis is by John at all, and prefers the conjecture that it is a gloss of some ancient allegorical interpreter introduced into the text. Other critics (Kuinoel, *Com. in N. T.*, 1817, iii., p. 445; Tholuck, *Com. Ev. Joh.* 5*te Aufl.*, 1837, p. 194; cf. Neander, *Leben J. C.* 7*te Ausg.* p. 398, anm. 1; Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ii., p. 81, n. 3) express similar views; but this explanation is resisted by the evidence of MSS. As the balance of opinion pronounces the interpretation within grammatical *possibility*, and the interpolation of the phrase may be equally possible, the objection must not be pressed.

[3] Baur, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 331; Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, p. 95 f.; Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii., p. 427; Schenkel, *Das Charakt. Jesu*, p. 354; Scholten, *Het Ev. Joh.*, p. 207. Keim (*Jes. v. Naz.*, i., p. 495, iii., p. 66, anm. 2) does not consider the events connected with the place historical. The reference is suggestively discussed by Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 210 f.; *Beitrage*, p. 256 f.; Caspari, *Chron. Geogr. Einl.*, 1869, p. 79 f.; Ebrard, *Ev. Joh.*, p. 68 f.; Ewald, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, v., p. 262, anm. 1; Farrar, *Life of Christ*, i., p. 140, n. 1; Grove, in Smith's *Dict. of Bible*, i., p. 194 f.; Hengstenberg, *Ev.*

baptising in Ænon, near to Salim, because there was much water there." This Ænon, near to Salim, was in Judæa, as is clearly stated in the previous verse. The place, however, was quite unknown even in the third century, and the nearest locality which could be indicated as possible was in the north of Samaria, and, therefore, differed from the statements in iii. 22, iv. 3.[1] Ænon signifies "springs," and the question arises whether the writer of the fourth Gospel, not knowing the real meaning of the word, did not simply mistake it for the name of a place.[2] In any case, there seems to be here another error into which the author of the fourth Gospel, had he been the Apostle John, could not have fallen.

The account of the miracle of the pool of Bethesda is a remarkable one for many reasons. The words which most pointedly relate the miraculous phenomena characterising the pool are rejected by many critics as an interpolation. In the following extract we put them in italics: v. 3.—"In these (five porches) lay a multitude of the sick, halt, withered, *waiting for the moving of the water.* 4. *For an angel went down at certain seasons into the pool and was troubling the water: he, therefore, who first went in after the troubling of the water was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.*" We maintain, however, that the obnoxious passage is no spurious interpolation, but that there is ample evidence, external and internal, to substantiate its claim to a place in the text. It is true that the whole passage is omitted by the Sinaitic and Vatican Codices, and by C; that A^1, L, 18, and others, omit the last phrase of verse 3, and that D, 33, which contain that phrase, omit the whole of verse 4, together with 157, 314 and some other MSS.; that in many codices in which the passage is found it is marked by an asterisk or obelus, and that it presents considerable variation in readings. It is also true that it is omitted by Cureton's Syriac, by the Thebaic, and by most of the Memphitic versions. But, on the other hand, it exists in the Alexandrian Codex, C^3, E, F. G, H, I, K, L, M, U, V, Γ, Δ, and other MSS.,[3] and it forms part of the Peschito, Jerusalem Syriac, Vulgate, Watkin's Memphitic, Æthiopic, and Armenian versions. More important still is the

Joh., i., p. 83 f.; Holtzmann, in Schenkel's *Bib. Lex.*, i., p. 420 f.; Meyer, *Ev. Joh.*, p. 103 f.; Winer, *Bibl. Realwörterb.*, i., p. 167. The itinerary indicated in the following passages should be borne in mind: John i. 18, 43, ii. 1, x. 40, xi. 1–18. The recent apologetic attempt to identify this Bethany with Tell Anihje, "*närrische weise*" as Keim contemptuously terms Caspari's proceeding, has signally failed.

[1] According to Eusebius and Jerome, it was shown in their day, near Salem and the Jordan, eight miles south of Scythopolis; but few critics adopt this site, which is, in fact, excluded by the statements of the evangelist himself.

[2] Scholten, *Het Ev. Joh.*, p. 435.

[3] The italicised words in verse 3, as we have already pointed out, are only by the second hand in A, but they are originally given in D and 33.

fact that it existed in the ancient Latin version of Tertullian, who refers to the passage;[1] and it is quoted by Didymus, Chrysostom, Cyril, Ambrose, Theophylact, Euthymius, and other Fathers. Its presence in the Alexandrian Codex alone might not compensate for the omission of the passage by the Sinaitic and Vatican Codices and C, D; but when the Alexandrian MS. is supported by the version used by Tertullian, which is a couple of centuries older than any of the other authorities, as well as by the Peschito, not to mention other codices, the balance of external evidence is distinctly in its favour.

The internal evidence is altogether on the side of the authenticity of the passage. It is true that there are a considerable number of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα in the few lines: ἐκδέχεσθαι, κίνησις, ταραχή, νόσημα, κατέχεσθαι, and perhaps δήποτε; but it must be remembered that the phenomena described are exceptional, and may well explain exceptional phraseology. On the other hand, ὑγιής is specially a Johannine word, used v. 4 and six times more in the fourth Gospel, but only five times in the rest of the New Testament; and ὑγιής with γίνεσθαι occurs in v. 4, 6, 9, 14, and with ποιεῖν in v. 11, 15, vii. 23, and nowhere else. ταράσσειν also may be indicated as employed in v. 4, 7, and five times more in other parts of the Gospel, and only eleven times in the rest of the New Testament; and the use of ταραχή in v. 4 is thus perhaps naturally accounted for. The context, however, forbids the removal of this passage. It is in the highest degree improbable that verse 3 could have ended with "withered" (ξηρῶν); and although many critics wish to retain the last phrase in verse 3, in order to explain verse 7, this only shows the necessity, without justifying the arbitrary maintenance of these words; whilst verse 4, which is still better attested, is excluded to get rid of the inconvenient angel. It is evident that the expression, "when the water was troubled" (ὅταν ταραχθῇ τὸ ὕδωρ), of the undoubted verse 7 is unintelligible without the explanation that the angel "was troubling the water" (ἐτάραττε τὸ ὕδωρ) of verse 4, and also that the statement of verse 7, "but while I am coming, another goeth down before me" (ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἔρχομαι ἐγώ, ἄλλος πρὸ ἐμοῦ καταβαίνει), absolutely requires the account: "he, therefore, who first went in, etc." (ὁ οὖν πρῶτος ἐμβάς κ. τ. λ.) of verse 4. The argument that the interpolation was made to explain the statement in verse 7 is untenable, for that statement necessarily presupposes the account in the verses under discussion, and cannot be severed from it. Even if the information that the water

[1] *Angelum aquis intervenire, si novum videtur, exemplum futuri praecucurrit. Piscinam Bethsaidam angelus interveniens commovebat. Observabant, qui valetudinem quærebantur; nam si quis prævenerat descendere illuc, queri post lavacrum desinebat* (*De Baptismo*, § 5).

was "troubled" at certain seasons only could have been dispensed with, it is obvious that the explanation of the condition of healing, given in verse 4, is indispensable to the appreciation of the lame man's complaint in verse 7, for without knowing that priority was essential the reason for the protracted waiting is inconceivable. It is also argued that the passage about the angel may have been interpolated to bring out the presence of supernatural agency; but it is much more reasonable to believe that attempts have been made to omit these verses, of which there is such ancient attestation, in order to eliminate an embarrassing excess of supernatural agency, and get rid of the difficulty presented by the fact, for which even Tertullian[1] endeavoured to account, that the supposed pool had ceased to exhibit any miraculous phenomena. This natural explanation is illustrated by the alacrity with which Apologists at the present day abandon the obnoxious passage.[2] The combined force of the external and internal evidence cannot, we think, be fairly resisted.[3]

Now, not only is the pool of Bethesda totally unknown at the present day, but, although possessed of such miraculous properties, it was not known even to Josephus, or any other writer of that time. It is inconceivable that, were the narrative genuine, the phenomena could have been unknown and unmentioned by the Jewish historian.[4] There is here evidently the narrative neither of an Apostle nor of an eye-witness.

Another very significant mistake occurs in the account of the conversation with the Samaritan woman, which is said to have taken place (iv. 5) near "a city of Samaria which is called Sychar." It is evident that there was no such place -and apologetic ingenuity is severely taxed to explain the difficulty.

[1] *Adv. Judæos*, § 13.

[2] "The Biblical critic is glad that he can remove these words from the record, and cannot be called upon to explain them" (Rev. H. W. Watkins, M.A., in *A New Test. Commentary for English Readers*, edited by Charles John Ellicott, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, i., p. 416).

[3] Without pretending to give an exhaustive list, we may mention the views of the following critics: —*In favour of the authenticity:* Von Ammon, Bengel, Burton, Baumgarten-Crusius, Grotius, Hahn, Hengstenberg, Hilgenfeld, Hofmann, Lachmann, Lampe, Lange, McClellan, Reuss, Scholz, Scrivener (doubtful), Sepp, Stier, Strauss, Tittmann, Webster and Wilkinson, Weisse, Wetstein, Wordsworth. Ebrard and Ewald are disposed to accept verse 3, and to reject verse 4 only. *Against the authenticity:* Alford, Bæumlein, Brückner, Davidson, Farrar, Godet, Griesbach, Kuinoel, Lightfoot, Lücke, Luthardt, Meyer, Milligan, Neander, Olshausen, Sanday, Scholten, Semler, Späth, Stemler, Storr, Tischendorf, Tholuck, Tregelles, Trench, Weizsäcker, Westcott, and Hort. The following are *doubtful:* Holtzmann, Schulz, Theile, de Wette.

[4] Cf. Lücke, *Com. Ev. Joh.*, ii., p. 16 f.; Ewald, *Die Joh. Schr.*, i., p. 200 f.

The common conjecture has been that the town of Sichem is intended, but this is rightly rejected by Delitzsch[1] and Ewald.[2] Credner,[3] not unsupported by others, and borne out in particular by the theory of Ewald, conjectures that Sychar is a corruption of Sichem, introduced into the Gospel by a Greek secretary to whom this part of the Gospel was dictated, and who mistook the Apostle's pronunciation of the final syllable. We constantly meet with this elastic explanation of difficulties in the Gospel, but its mere enunciation displays at once the reality of the difficulties and the imaginary nature of the explanation. Hengstenberg adopts the view, and presses it with pious earnestness, that the term is a mere nickname for the city of Sichem, and that, by so slight a change in the pronunciation, the Apostle called the place a city of Lies –a play upon words which he does not consider unworthy.[4] The only support which this latter theory can secure from internal evidence is to be derived from the fact that the whole discourse with the woman is ideal. Hengstenberg[5] conjectures that the five husbands of the woman are typical of the Gods of the five nations with which the King of Assyria peopled Samaria, 2 Kings xvii. 24–41, and which they worshipped instead of the God of Israel; and as the actual God of the Samaritans was not recognised as the true God by the Jews, nor their worship of him on Mount Gerizim held to be valid, he considers that under the name of the City of Sychar their whole religion, past and present, was denounced as a lie. There can be little doubt that the episode is allegorical, but such a defence of the geographical error, the reality of which is everywhere felt, whilst it is quite insufficient on the one hand, effectually destroys the historical character of the Gospel on the other. The inferences from all of the foregoing examples are strengthened by the fact that, in the quotations from the Old Testament, the fourth Gospel in the main follows the Septuagint version, or shows its influence, and nowhere can be shown directly to translate from the Hebrew.

These instances might be multiplied, but we must proceed to examine more closely the indications given in the Gospel as to the identity of its author. We need not point out that the writer nowhere clearly states who he is, nor mentions his name; but expressions are frequently used which evidently show the desire that a particular person should be understood. He

[1] *Talmudische Stud. Zeitschr. gesammt. luth. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1856, p. 240 f.

[2] *Die Joh. Schr.*, i., p. 181, anm. 1; *Gesch. V. Isr.*, v., p. 348, anm. 1; *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, viii., p. 255 f.

[3] *Einl. N. T.*, i., p. 264.

[4] *Das Ev. des heil. Joh.*, 1867, i., p. 244.

[5] *Ib.*, i., p. 262 f.

generally calls himself "the other disciple," or "the disciple whom Jesus loved."[1] It is universally understood that he represents himself as having previously been a disciple of John the Baptist (i. 35 f.), and also that he is "the other disciple" who was acquainted with the high priest (xviii. 15, 16), if not an actual relative, as Ewald and others assert.[2] The assumption that the disciple thus indicated is John rests principally on the fact that, whilst the author mentions the other Apostles, he seems studiously to avoid directly naming John, and also that he never distinguishes John the Baptist by the appellation ὁ βαπτιστής, whilst he carefully distinguishes the two disciples of the name of Judas, and always speaks of the Apostle Peter as "Simon Peter," or "Peter," but rarely as "Simon" only. Without pausing to consider the slightness of this evidence, it is obvious that, supposing the disciple indicated to be John the son of Zebedee, the fourth Gospel gives a representation of him quite different from the Synoptics and other writings. In the fourth Gospel (i. 35 f.) the calling of the Apostle is described in a peculiar manner. John (the Baptist) is standing with two of his disciples, and points out Jesus to them as "the Lamb of God," whereupon the two disciples follow Jesus, and, finding out where he lives, abide with him that day and subsequently attach themselves to his person. In verse 40 it is stated: "One of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother." We are left to imagine who was the other, and the answer of critics is, John. Now, the "calling" of John is related in a totally different manner in the Synoptics. Jesus, walking by the Sea of Galilee, sees "two brethren, Simon called Peter and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea, for they were fishers, and he saith unto them: Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. And they straightway left their nets and followed him. And when he had gone from thence, he saw other two brethren, James the son of Zebedee and John his brother, in the ship with Zebedee their father mending their nets; and he called them. And they immediately left the ship and their father and followed him."[3] These accounts are in complete contradiction to each other, and both cannot be true. We see, from the first introduction of "the other disciple" on the scene, in the fourth Gospel, the evident design to give him the precedence before Peter and the rest of the Apostles. We have above given the account of the first two Synoptists of the calling of

[1] John i. 35 f.; xiii. 23; xix. 26, 35; xx. 2.

[2] Ewald, *Die. Joh. Schr.*, i., p. 400; Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 151. Ewald considers the relationship to have been on the mother's side. Hengstenberg contradicts that strange assumption (*Das Ev. heil. Joh.*, iii., p. 196).

[3] Matt. iv. 18–22; Mark i. 16–20.

Peter, according to which he is the first of the disciples who is selected, and he is directly invited by Jesus to follow him and become, with his brother Andrew, "fishers of men." James and John are not called till later in the day, and without the record of any special address. In the third Gospel the calling of Peter is introduced with still more important details. Jesus enters the boat of Simon and bids him push out into the Lake and let down his net, and the miraculous draught of fishes is taken: "When Simon Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus's knees saying: Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord. For he was astonished, and all that were with him, at the draught of fishes which they had taken." The calling of the sons of Zebedee becomes even less important here, for the account simply continues: "And so were also James and John, the sons of Zebedee, who were partners with Simon." Jesus then addresses his invitation to Simon, and the account concludes: "And when they had brought their boats to land, they forsook all, and followed him."[1] In the fourth Gospel the calling of the two disciples of John is first narrated, as we have seen, and the first call of Peter is from his brother Andrew, and not from Jesus himself. "He (Andrew) first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him: We have found the Messias (which is, being interpreted, Christ), and he brought him to Jesus. Jesus looked on him and said: Thou art Simon, the son of Jonas;[2] thou shalt be called Cephas (which is, by interpretation, Peter)."[3] This explanation of the manner in which the cognomen Peter is given, we need not point out, is likewise contradictory to the Synoptics, and betrays the same purpose of suppressing the prominence of Peter.

The fourth Gospel states that "the other disciple," who is declared to be John, the author of the Gospel, was known to the high priest, another trait amongst many others elevating him above the son of Zebedee as he is depicted elsewhere in the New Testament. The account which the fourth Gospel gives of the trial of Jesus is in very many important particulars at variance with that of the Synoptics. We need only mention here the point that the latter know nothing of the preliminary examination by Annas. We shall not discuss the question as to where the denial of Peter is represented as taking place in the fourth Gospel, but may merely say that no other disciple but Peter is mentioned in the Synoptics as having followed Jesus; and Peter

[1] Luke v. 1–11.

[2] The author apparently considered that Jonas and John were the same name—another indication of a foreigner. Although some of the oldest codices read John here and in xxi. 15–17, there is great authority for the reading Jona, which is considered by a majority of critics the original.

[3] John i. 41–42.

enters without difficulty into the high priest's palace.[1] In the fourth Gospel, Peter is made to wait without at the door until John, who is a friend of the high priest and freely enters, obtains permission for Peter to go in—another instance of the precedence which is systematically given to John. The Synoptics do not in this particular case give any support to the statement in the fourth Gospel, and certainly in nothing that is said of John elsewhere do they render his acquaintance with the high priest in the least degree probable. It is, on the contrary, improbable in the extreme that the young fisherman of Galilee, who shows very little enlightenment in the anecdotes told of him in the Synoptics, and who is described as an "unlettered and ignorant" man in the Acts of the Apostles, could have any acquaintance with the high priest. Ewald, who on the strength of the word γνωστός,[2] at once elevates him into a relation of the high priest, sees in the statement of Polycrates that late in life he wore the priestly πέταλον—a confirmation of the supposition that he was of the high priest's race and family.[3] The evident Judaistic tendency which made John wear the priestly mitre may distinguish him as author of the Apocalypse, but it is fatal to the theory which makes him author of the fourth Gospel, in which there is so complete a severance from Judaism.

A much more important point is the designation of the author of the fourth Gospel, who is identified with the Apostle John, as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." It is scarcely too much to say that this suggestive appellation alone has done more than any arguments to ensure the recognition of the work, and to overcome doubts as to its authenticity. Religious sentimentality, evoked by the influence of this tender epithet, has been blind to historical incongruities, and has been willing to accept, with little question, from the "beloved disciple" a portrait of Jesus totally unlike that of the Synoptics, and to elevate the dogmatic mysticism and artificial discourses of the one over the pure morality and simple eloquence of the other. It is impossible to reflect seriously upon this representation of the relations between one of the disciples and Jesus without the conviction that every record of the life of the great Teacher must have borne distinct traces of the preference, and that the disciple so honoured must have attracted the notice of every early writer acquainted with the facts. If we seek for any evidence, however, that John was distinguished with such special affection—that he lay on the breast of Jesus at supper—that even the Apostle Peter recognised his superior

[1] Matt. xxvi. 58, 69; Mark xiv. 54, 56; Luke xxii. 54 f.
[2] John xviii. 15.
[3] *Die Joh. Schr.*, i., p. 400, anm. 1; Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 15.

intimacy and influence,[1] and that he received at the foot of the cross the care of his mother from the dying Jesus,[2] we seek in vain. The synoptic Gospels, which minutely record the details of the last supper and of the crucifixion, so far from reporting any such circumstances or such distinction of John, do not even mention his name; and Peter everywhere has precedence before the sons of Zebedee. Almost the only occasions upon which any prominence is given to them are episodes in which they incur the Master's displeasure, and the cognomen of "Sons of thunder" has certainly no suggestion in it of special affection, nor of personal qualities likely to attract the great Teacher. The selfish ambition of the brothers who desire to sit on thrones on his right and on his left, and the intolerant temper which would have called down fire from heaven to consume a Samaritan village, much rather contradict than support the representation of the fourth Gospel. Upon one occasion, indeed, Jesus, in rebuking them, adds: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."[3] It is perfectly undeniable that John nowhere has any such position accorded to him in the Synoptics as this designation in the fourth Gospel implies. In the lists of the disciples he is always put in the fourth place,[4] and in the first two Gospels his only distinguishing designation is that of "the brother of James," or one of the sons of Zebedee. The Apostle Peter, in all of the Synoptics, is the leader of the disciples. He it is who alone is represented as the mouthpiece of the Twelve, or as holding conversation with Jesus; and the only occasions on which the sons of Zebedee address Jesus are those to which we have referred, upon which his displeasure was incurred. The angel who appears to the women after the resurrection desires them to tell his disciples "and Peter" that Jesus will meet them in Galilee;[5] but there is no message for any "disciple whom he loved." If Peter, James, and John accompany the Master to the mount of transfiguration, and are witnesses of his agony in the garden, regarding which, however, the fourth Gospel is totally silent, the two brethren remain in the background, and Peter alone acts a prominent part. If we turn to the Epistles of Paul, we do not find a single trace of acquaintance with the fact that Jesus honoured John with any special affection, and the opportunity of referring to such a distinction was not wanting when he writes to the Galatians of his visit to the "Pillar" Apostles

[1] John xiii. 23–26. [2] *Ib.*, xix. 25–27.

[3] Luke ix. 55. These words are omitted from some of the oldest MSS., but they are in *Cod. D (Bezæ)* and many other very important texts, as well as in some of the oldest versions, besides being quoted by the Fathers. They were probably omitted after the claim of John to be the "beloved disciple" became admitted.

[4] Matt. x. 2–4; Mark iii. 16–19; Luke vi. 14–16. [5] Mark xvi. 7.

in Jerusalem. Here again we find no prominence given to John, but the contrary, his name still being mentioned last and without any special comment. In none of the Pauline or other Epistles is there any allusion, however distant, to any disciple whom Jesus specially loved. The Apocalypse, which, if any book of the New Testament can be traced to him, must be ascribed to the Apostle John, makes no claim to such a distinction. In none of the Apocryphal Gospels is there the slightest indication of knowledge of the fact, and, if we come to the Fathers even, it is a striking circumstance that there is not a trace of it in any early work, and not the most remote indication of any independent tradition that Jesus distinguished John, or any other individual disciple, with peculiar friendship. The Roman Clement, in referring to the example of the Apostles, only mentions Peter and Paul.[1] Polycarp, who is described as a disciple of the Apostle John, apparently knows nothing of his having been especially loved by Jesus. Pseudo-Ignatius does not refer to him at all in the Syriac Epistles, or in either version of the seven Epistles.[2] Papias, in describing his interest in hearing what the Apostles said, gives John no prominence: "I inquired minutely after the words of the Presbyters: What Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew, or what any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what Aristion and the Presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, say,"[3] etc.

As a fact, it is undenied and undeniable that the representation of John, or of any other disciple, as specially beloved by Jesus is limited solely and entirely to the fourth Gospel, and that there is not even a trace of independent tradition to support the claim; whilst, on the other hand, the total silence of the earlier Gospels and of the other New Testament writings on the point, and indeed their data of a positive and unmistakable character oppose rather than support the correctness of the later and mere personal assertion. Those who abandon sober criticism, and indulge in sentimental rhapsodies on the impossibility of the author of the fourth Gospel being any other than "the disciple whom Jesus loved," strangely ignore the fact that we have no reason whatever, except the assurance of the author himself, to believe that Jesus specially loved any disciple, and much less John, the son of Zebedee. Indeed, the statements of the fourth Gospel itself on the subject are so indirect and intentionally vague that it is not absolutely

[1] *Ad Corinth.*, v.

[2] Indeed, in the universally-repudiated Epistles, beyond the fact that two are addressed to John, in which he is not called "the disciple whom Jesus loved," the only mention of him is the statement, "John was banished to Patmos" (*Ad Tars.*, iii.).

[3] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39.

clear what disciple is indicated as "the beloved," and it has even been maintained that not John the son of Zebedee, but Andrew the brother of Simon Peter, was "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and consequently the supposed author of the fourth Gospel.[1]

We have hitherto refrained from referring to one of the most singular features of the fourth Gospel, the chapter xxi., which is by many cited as the most ancient testimony for the authenticity of the work, and which requires particular consideration. It is obvious that the Gospel is brought to a conclusion by verses 30, 31 of chapter xx., and critics are universally agreed at least that, whoever may be its author, chapter xxi. is a supplement only added after an interval. By whom was it written? As may be supposed, critics have given very different replies to this important question. Many affirm, and with much probability, that chapter xxi. was subsequently added to the Gospel by the author himself. A few, however, exclude the last two verses, which they consider to have been added by another hand. A much larger number assert that the whole chapter is an ancient appendix to the Gospel by a writer who was not the author of the Gospel. A few likewise reject the last two verses of the preceding chapter. In this supplement (v. 20) "the disciple whom Jesus loved, who also leaned on his breast at the supper and said: Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee?" is (v. 24) identified with the author of the Gospel.

We may here state the theory of Ewald with regard to the composition of the fourth Gospel, which is largely deduced from considerations connected with the last chapter, and which, although more audaciously minute in its positive and arbitrary statement of details than any other with which we are acquainted, introduces more or less the explanations generally given regarding the composition of chapter xxi. Out of all the indications in the work, Ewald decides:—

"1. That the Gospel, completed at the end of chapter xx., was composed by the apostle about the year 80, with the free help of friends, not to be immediately circulated throughout the world, but to remain limited to the narrower circle of friends until his death, and only then to be published as his legacy to the whole of Christendom. In this position it remained ten years, or even longer.

"2. As the preconceived opinion regarding the life or death of the Apostle (xxi. 23) had perniciously spread itself throughout the whole of Christendom, the Apostle himself decided, even before his death, to counteract it in the right way by giving a correct statement of the circumstances. The same friends, therefore,

[1] Lützelberger, *Die kirchl. Tradition über d. Apost. Joh.*, p. 199 f.

assisted him to design the very important supplement, chapter xxi., and this could still be very easily added, as the book was not yet published. His friends proceeded, nevertheless, somewhat more freely in its composition than previously in writing the book itself, and allowed their own hand more clearly to gleam through, although here, as in the rest of the work, they conformed to the will of the Apostle, and did not, even in the supplement, openly declare his name as the author. As the supplement, however, was to form a closely connected part of the whole work, they gave at its end (verses 24 f.), as it now seemed to them suitable, a new conclusion to the augmented work.

"3. As the Apostle himself desired that the preconceived opinion regarding him, which had been spread abroad to the prejudice of Christendom, should be contradicted as soon as possible, and even before his death, he now so far departed from his earlier wish that he permitted the circulation of his Gospel before his death. We can accept this with all certainty, and have therein trustworthy testimony regarding the whole original history of our book.

"4. When the Gospel was thus published it was for the first time gradually named after our Apostle, even in its external superscription: a nomination which had then become all the more necessary and permanent for the purpose of distinction, as it was united in one whole with the other Gospels. The world, however, has at all times known it only under this wholly right title, and could in no way otherwise know it and otherwise name it."[1]

In addressing ourselves to each of these points in detail, we shall be able to discuss the principal questions connected with the fourth Gospel.

The theory of Ewald, that the fourth Gospel was written down with the assistance of friends in Ephesus, has been imagined solely to conciliate certain phenomena presented throughout the Gospel, and notably in the last chapter, with the foregone conclusion that it was written by the Apostle John. It is apparent that there is not a single word in the work itself explaining such a mode of composition, and that the hypothesis proceeds purely from the ingenious imagination of the critic. The character of the language, the manner in which the writer is indirectly indicated in the third person, and the reference, even in the body of the work (xix. 35), to the testimony of a third person, combined with the similarity of the style of the supplementary chapter, which is an obvious addition intended, however, to be understood as written by a different hand, have rendered these conjectures necessary to reconcile such obvious incongruities with the ascription of the work to the Apostle. The substantial identity of the style and

[1] *Die Joh. Schr.*, i., p. 56 f.; cf. *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, iii., p. 171 f.

vocabulary of chapter xxi. with the rest of the Gospel is asserted by a multitude of the most competent critics. Ewald, whilst he recognises the great similarity, maintains at the same time a real dissimilarity, for which he accounts in the manner just quoted. The language, Ewald admits, agrees fully in many rare *nuances* with that of the rest of the Gospel, but he does not take the trouble to prove the decided dissimilarities which, he asserts, likewise exist. A less difference than that which he finds might, he thinks, be explained by the interval which had elapsed between the writing of the work and of the supplement, but "the wonderful similarity, in the midst of even greater dissimilarity, of the whole tone and particularly of the style of the composition is not thereby accounted for. This, therefore, leads us," he continues, "to the opinion: The Apostle made use, for writing down his words, of the hand and even of the skill of a trusted friend who later, on his own authority *(für sich allein)*, wrote the supplement. The great similarity, as well as dissimilarity, of the style of both parts in this way becomes intelligible: the trusted friend (probably a Presbyter in Ephesus) adopted much of the language and mode of expression of the youthful old Apostle, without, however, where he wrote more in his own person, being carefully solicitous of imitating them. But even through this contrast, and the definite declaration in v. 24, the Apostolical origin of the book itself becomes all the more clearly apparent; and thus the supplement proves from the most diverse sides how certainly this Gospel was written by the trusted disciple."[1] Elsewhere Ewald more clearly explains the share in the work which he assigns to the Apostle's disciple: "The proposition that the Apostle composed in a unique way our likewise unique Gospel is to be understood only with the important limitation upon which I have always laid so much stress: for John himself did not compose this work quite so directly as Paul did most of his Epistles, but the young friend who wrote it down from his lips, and who, in the later appendix, chapter xxi., comes forward in the most open way, without desiring in the slightest to conceal his separate identity, does his work at other times somewhat freely, in that he never introduces the narrator speaking of himself and his participation in the events with 'I' or 'we,' but only indirectly indicates his presence at such events, and, towards the end, in preference refers to him, from his altogether peculiar relation to Christ, as 'the disciple whom the Lord loved,' so that, in one passage, in regard to an important historical testimony (xix. 35), he even speaks of him as of a third person." Ewald then maintains that the agreement between the Gospel and the Epistles, and more especially the first, which he affirms, without

[1] *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, iii., 1850–51, p. 173.

vouchsafing a word of evidence, to have been written down by a different hand, proves that we have substantially only the Apostle's very peculiar composition, and that his friend as much as possible gave his own words.[1]

It is obvious from this elaborate explanation, which we need scarcely say is composed of mere assumptions, that, in order to connect the Apostle John with the Gospel, Ewald is obliged to assign him a very peculiar position in regard to it: he recognises that some of the characteristics of the work exclude the supposition that the Apostle could himself have written the Gospel, so he represents him as dictating it, and his secretary as taking considerable liberties with the composition as he writes it down, and even as introducing references of his own; as, for instance, in the passage to which he refers, where, in regard to the statement that at the Crucifixion a soldier pierced the side of the already dead Jesus and that forthwith there came out blood and water (xix. 35), it is said: "And he that saw it hath borne witness, and his witness is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye may believe."[2] It is perfectly clear that the writer refers to the testimony of another person -the friend who is writing down the narrative, says Ewald, refers to the Apostle who is actually dictating it. Again, in the last chapter, as elsewhere throughout the work, "the disciple whom Jesus loved," who is the author, is spoken of in the third person, and also in verse 24: "This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things" (καὶ γράψας ταῦτα). This, according to Ewald, is the same secretary, now writing in his own person. The similarity between this declaration and the appeal to the testimony of another person, in xix. 35, is certainly complete, and there can be no doubt that both proceed from the same pen; but beyond the assertion of Ewald there is not the slightest evidence that a secretary wrote the Gospel from the dictation of another, and ventured to interrupt the narrative by such a reference to testimony, which, upon the supposition that the Apostle John was known as the actual author, is singularly out of place. If John wrote the Gospel, why should he appeal in utterly vague terms to his own testimony, and upon such a point, when the mere fact that he himself wrote the statement was the most direct testimony in itself? An author who composed a work which he desired to ascribe to a "disciple whom Jesus loved" might have made such a reference as xix. 35, in his anxiety to support this affirmation, without supposing

[1] *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, x., 1859–60, p. 87 f.

[2] We do not go into any discussion on the use of the word ἐκεῖνος. We believe that the reference is distinctly to another; but even if taken to be to himself in the third person, the passage is not less extraordinary, and the argument holds.

that he had really compromised his design, and might have naturally added such a statement as that in the last two verses; but nothing but the foregone conclusion that the Apostle John was the real author could have suggested such an explanation of these passages. It is throughout assumed by Ewald and others that John wrote in the first instance, at least, specially for a narrow circle of friends, and the proof of this is considered to be the statement of the object with which it was written: "that ye may believe,"[1] etc.—a phrase, we may remark, which is identical with that of the very verse (xix. 35) with which the secretary is supposed to have had so much to do. It is very remarkable, upon this hypothesis, that in xix. 35 it is considered necessary even for this narrow circle, who knew the Apostle so well, to make such an appeal, as well as to attach at its close (xxi. 24), for the benefit of the world in general as Ewald will have it, a certificate of the trustworthiness of the Gospel.

Upon no hypothesis which supposes the Apostle John the author of the fourth Gospel is such an explanation credible. That the Apostle himself could have written of himself the words in xix. 35 is impossible. After having stated so much that is more surprising and contradictory to all experience without reference to any witness, it would indeed have been strange had he here appealed to himself as to a separate individual; and, on the other hand, it is quite inadmissible to assume that a friend to whom he is dictating should interrupt the narrative to introduce a passage so inappropriate to the work, and so unnecessary for any circle acquainted with the Apostolic author. If, as Ewald argues, the peculiarities of his style of composition were so well known that it was unnecessary for the writer more clearly to designate himself either for the first readers or for the Christian world, the passages we are discussing are all the more inappropriate. That any guarantee of the truth of the Gospel should have been thought desirable for readers who knew the work to be composed by the Apostle John, and who believed him to be "the disciple whom Jesus loved," is inconceivable, and that any anonymous and quite indirect testimony to its genuineness should either have been considered necessary or of any value is still more incredible. It is impossible that nameless Presbyters of Ephesus could venture to accredit a Gospel written by the Apostle John; and any intended attestation must have taken the simple and direct course of stating that the work had been composed by the Apostle. The peculiarities we are discussing seem to us explicable only upon the supposition that the unknown writer of the Gospel desired that it should be understood to be written by a certain

[1] John xx. 31.

disciple whom Jesus loved, but did not choose distinctly to name him or directly to make such an affirmation.

It is, we assert, impossible that an Apostle who composed a history of the life and teaching of Jesus could have failed to attach his name, naturally and simply, as testimony of the trustworthiness of his statements, and of his fitness as an eye-witness to compose such a record. As the writer of the fourth Gospel does not state his name, Ewald ascribes the omission to the "incomparable modesty and delicacy of feeling" of the Apostle John. We must further briefly examine the validity of this explanation. It is universally admitted, and by Ewald himself, that although the writer does not directly name himself, he very clearly indicates that he is "the other disciple" and "the disciple whom Jesus loved." We must affirm that such a mode of indicating himself is incomparably less modest than the simple statement of his name, and it is indeed a glorification of himself beyond anything in the Apocalypse. But not only is the explanation thus discredited, but, in comparing the details of the Gospel with those of the Synoptics, we find still more certainly how little modesty had to do with the suppression of his name. In the Synoptics a very marked precedence of the rest of the disciples is ascribed to the Apostle Peter; and the sons of Zebedee are represented in all of them as holding a subordinate place. This representation is confirmed by the Pauline Epistles and by tradition. In the fourth Gospel a very different account is given, and the author studiously elevates the Apostle John—that is to say, according to the theory that he is the writer of the Gospel, himself—in every way above the Apostle Peter. Apart from the general pre-eminence claimed for himself in the very name of "the disciple whom Jesus loved," we have seen that he deprives Peter in his own favour of the honour of being the first of the disciples who was called; he suppresses the account of the circumstances under which that Apostle was named Peter, and gives another and trifling version of the incident, reporting elsewhere indeed in a very subdued and modified form, and without the commendation of the Master, the recognition of the divinity of Jesus, which, in the first Gospel, is the cause of his change of name.[1] He is the intimate friend of the Master, and even Peter has to beg him to ask at the Supper who was the betrayer. He describes himself as the friend of the High Priest, and while Peter is excluded, he not only is able to enter into his palace, but he is the means of introducing Peter. The denial of Peter is given without mitigation, but his bitter repentance is not mentioned. He it is who is singled out by the dying Jesus and entrusted with the charge of his mother. He outruns

[1] Matt. xvi. 13–19; cf. Mark viii. 29, Luke ix. 20.

Peter in their race to the Sepulchre, and in the final appearance of Jesus (xxi. 15) the more important position is assigned to the disciple whom Jesus loved. It is, therefore, absurd to speak of the incomparable modesty of the writer, who, if he does not give his name, not only clearly indicates himself, but throughout assumes a pre-eminence which is not supported by the authority of the Synoptics and other writings, but is heard of alone from his own narrative.

Ewald argues that chap. xxi. must have been written, and the Gospel as we have it, therefore, have been completed, before the death of the Apostle John. He considers the supplement to have been added specially to contradict the report regarding John (xxi. 23). "The supplement must have been written whilst John still lived," he asserts, "for only before his death was it worth while to contradict such a false hope: and if his death had actually taken place, the result itself would have already refuted so erroneous an interpretation of the words of Christ, and it would then have been much more appropriate to explain afresh the sense of the words, 'till I come.' Moreover, there is no reference here to the death as having already occurred, although a small addition to that effect in verse 24 would have been so easy. But if we were to suppose that John had long been dead when this was written, the whole rectification as it is given would be utterly without sense."[1] On the contrary, we affirm that the whole history of the first two centuries renders it certain that the Apostle was already dead, and that the explanation was not a rectification of false hopes during his lifetime, but an explanation of the failure of expectations which had already taken place, and probably excited some scandal. We know how the early Church looked for the immediate coming of the glorified Christ, and how such hopes sustained persecuted Christians in their sorrow and suffering. This is very clearly expressed in 1 Thess. iv. 15–18, where the expectation of the second coming within the lifetime of the writer and readers of the Epistle is confidently stated, and elsewhere, and even in 1 John ii. 18, the belief that the "last times" had arrived is expressed. The history of the Apocalypse in relation to the Canon illustrates the case. So long as the belief in the early consummation of all things continued strong, the Apocalypse was the favourite writing of the early Church; but when time went on, and the second coming of Christ did not take place, the opinion of Christendom regarding the work changed, and disappointment, as well as the desire to explain the non-fulfilment of prophecies upon which so much hope had been based, led many to reject the Apocalypse as an unintelligible and fallacious book. We venture to conjecture

[1] *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, iii., 1850–51, p. 173.

that the tradition that John should not die until the second coming of Jesus may have originated with the Apocalypse, where that event is announced to John as immediately to take place, xxii. 7, 10, 12, and the words with which the book ends are of this nature, and express the expectation of the writer, 20: "He which testifieth these things saith: Surely I come quickly. Amen. Come, Lord Jesus." It was not in the spirit of the age to hesitate about such anticipations, and so long as the Apostle lived such a tradition would scarcely have required or received contradiction from anyone, the belief being universal that the coming of Jesus might take place any day, and assuredly would not be long delayed. When the Apostle was dead, however, and the tradition that it had been foretold that he should live until the coming of the Lord exercised men's minds, and doubt and disappointment at the non-fulfilment of what may have been regarded as prophecy produced a prejudicial effect upon Christendom, it seemed to the writer of this Gospel a desirable thing to point out that too much stress had been laid upon the tradition, and that the words which had been relied upon in the first instance did not justify the expectations which had been formed from them. This also contradicts the hypothesis that the Apostle John was the author of the Gospel.

Such a passage as xix. 35, received in any natural sense, or interpreted in any way which can be supported by evidence, shows that the writer of the Gospel was not an eye-witness of the events recorded, but appeals to the testimony of others. It is generally admitted that the expressions in ch. i. 14 are of universal application, and capable of being adopted by all Christians, and, consequently, that they do not imply any direct claim on the part of the writer to personal knowledge of Jesus. We must now examine whether the Gospel itself bears special marks of having been written by an eye-witness, and how far in this respect it bears out the assertion that it was written by the Apostle John. It is constantly asserted that the minuteness of the details in the fourth Gospel indicates that it must have been written by one who was present at the scenes he records. With regard to this point we need only generally remark that in the works of imagination of which the world is full, and the singular realism of many of which is recognised by all, we have the most minute and natural details of scenes which never occurred, and of conversations which never took place, the actors in which never actually existed. Ewald admits that it is undeniable that the fourth Gospel was written with a fixed purpose, and with artistic design; and, indeed, he goes further, and recognises that the Apostle could not possibly so long have recollected the discourses of Jesus and verbally reproduced them, so that, in fact, we have only, at best, a substantial

report of the matter of those discourses coloured by the mind of the author himself.[1] Details of scenes at which we were not present may be admirably supplied by imagination, and, as we cannot compare what is here described as taking place with what actually took place, the argument that the author must have been an eye-witness because he gives such details is without validity. Moreover, the details of the fourth Gospel in many cases do not agree with those of the three Synoptics, and it is an undoubted fact that the author of the fourth Gospel gives the details of scenes at which the Apostle John was not present, and reports the discourses and conversations on such occasions with the very same minuteness as those at which he is said to have been present; as, for instance, the interview between Jesus and the woman of Samaria. It is undeniable that the writer had other Gospels before him when he composed his work, and that he made use of other materials than his own.

It is by no means difficult, however, to point out very clear indications that the author was not an eye-witness, but constructed his scenes and discourses artistically and for effect. We shall not, at present, dwell upon the almost uniform artifice adopted in most of the dialogues, in which the listeners either misunderstand altogether the words of Jesus, or interpret them in a foolish and material way, and thus afford him an opportunity of enlarging upon the theme. For instance, Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, misunderstands the expression of Jesus, that in order to see the kingdom of God a man must be born from above, and asks: "How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?"[2] Now, as it is well known, and as we have already shown, the common expression used in regard to a proselyte to Judaism was that of being born again, with which every Jew, and more especially every "ruler of the Jews," must have been well acquainted. The stupidity which he displays in his conversation with Jesus, and with which the author endowed all who came in contact with him, in order by the contrast to mark more strongly the superiority of the Master, even draws from Jesus the remark, "Art thou the teacher of Israel, and understandest not these things?"[3] There can be no doubt that the scene was ideal, and it is scarcely possible that a Jew could have written it. In the Synoptics, Jesus is reported as quoting against the people of his own city, Nazareth, who rejected him, the proverb, "A prophet has no honour in his own country."[4] The appropriateness of the remark here is obvious. The author of the fourth Gospel, however, shows clearly that he was neither

[1] *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, x., p. 91 f. [2] *Ib.*, iii. 4. [3] *Ib.*, iii. 10.
[4] Matt. xiii. 57; Mark vi. 4; Luke iv. 24.

an eye-witness nor acquainted with the subject or country when he introduces this proverb in a different place. Jesus is represented as staying two days at Sychar after his conversation with the Samaritan woman. "Now after the two days he departed thence into Galilee. For (γάρ) Jesus himself testified that a prophet hath no honour in his own country. When, therefore (οὖν), he came into Galilee, the Galilæans received him, having seen all the things that he did in Jerusalem at the feast—for they also went unto the feast."[1] It is manifest that the quotation here is quite out of place, and none of the ingenious but untenable explanations of apologists can make it appropriate. He is made to go into Galilee, which was his country, because a prophet has no honour in his country, and the Galilæans are represented as receiving him, which is a contradiction of the proverb. The writer evidently misunderstood the facts of the case or deliberately desired to deny the connection of Jesus with Nazareth and Galilee, in accordance with his evident intention of associating the Logos only with the Holy City. We must not pause to show that the author is generally unjust to the Galilæans, and displays an ignorance regarding them very unlike what we should expect from the fisherman of Galilee.[2] We have already alluded to the artificial character of the conversation with the woman of Samaria, which, although given with so much detail, occurred at a place totally unknown (perhaps allegorically called the "City of Lies"), at which the Apostle John was not present, and the substance of which was typical of Samaria and its five nations and false gods. The continuation in the Gospel is as unreal as the conversation.

Another instance displaying personal ignorance is the insertion into a discourse at the Last Supper, and without any appropriate connection with the context, the passage: "Verily, verily, I say unto you: he that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me."[3] In the Synoptics this sentence is naturally represented as part of the address to the disciples who are to be sent forth to preach the Gospel;[4] but it is clear that its insertion here is a mistake.[5] Again, a very obvious slip, which betrays that what was intended for realistic detail is nothing but a reminiscence of some earlier

[1] John iv. 43–45.

[2] We may merely refer to the remark of the Pharisees: Search the Scriptures and see, "for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet" (vii. 52). The Pharisees could not have been ignorant of the fact that the prophets Jonah and Nahum were Galilæans, and the son of Zebedee could not have committed such an error (cf. Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, p. 99 f.).

[3] John xiii. 20. [4] Matt. x. 40; cf. xviii. 5; Luke x. 16, cf. ix. 48.

[5] This is recognised by de Wette (*Einl. N. T.*, p. 211 c).

Gospel misapplied, occurs in a later part of the discourses very inappropriately introduced as being delivered on the same occasion. At the end of xiv. 31 Jesus is represented, after saying that he would no more talk much with the disciples, as suddenly breaking off with the words: "Arise, let us go hence" (Ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν). They do not, however, arise and go thence, but, on the contrary, Jesus at once commences another long discourse: "I am the true vine," etc. The expression is merely introduced artistically to close one discourse, and enable the writer to begin another; and the idea is taken from some earlier work. For instance, in our first Synoptic, at the close of the Agony in the Garden, which the fourth Gospel ignores altogether, Jesus says to the awakened disciples: "Rise, let us go" (Ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν).[1] We need not go on with these illustrations, but the fact that the author is not an eye-witness recording scenes which he beheld and discourses which he heard, but a writer composing an ideal Gospel on a fixed plan, will become more palpable as we proceed.

It is not necessary to enter upon any argument to prove the fundamental difference which exists in every respect between the Synoptics and the fourth Gospel. This is admitted even by Apologists, whose efforts to reconcile the discordant elements are totally unsuccessful. "It is impossible to pass from the synoptic Gospels to that of St. John," says Dr. Westcott, "without feeling that the transition involves the passage from one world of thought to another. No familiarity with the general teaching of the Gospels, no wide conception of the character of the Saviour, is sufficient to destroy the contrast which exists in form and spirit between the earlier and later narratives."[2] The difference between the fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, not only as regards the teaching of Jesus but also the facts of the narrative, is so great that it is impossible to harmonise them, and no one who seriously considers the matter can fail to see that both cannot be accepted as correct. If we believe that the Synoptics give a truthful representation of the life and teaching of Jesus, it follows of necessity that, in whatever category we may decide to place the fourth Gospel, it must be rejected as a historical work. The theories which are most in favour as regards it may place the Gospel in a high position as an ideal composition, but sober criticism must infallibly pronounce that they exclude it altogether from the province of history. There is no option but to accept it as the only genuine report of the sayings and doings of Jesus,

[1] Matt. xxvi. 46; Mark xiv. 42. De Wette likewise admits this mistaken reminiscence (*Einl. N. T.*, p. 211 c).

[2] *Introd. to Study of the Gospels*, p. 249.

rejecting the Synoptics, or to remove it at once to another department of literature. The Synoptics certainly contradict each other in many minor details, but they are not in fundamental disagreement with each other, and evidently present the same portrait of Jesus and the same view of his teaching derived from the same sources.

The vast difference which exists between the representation of Jesus in the fourth Gospel and in the Synoptics is too well recognised to require minute demonstration. We must, however, point out some of the distinctive features. We need not do more here than refer to the fact that, whilst the Synoptics relate the circumstances of the birth of Jesus (two of them at least), and give some history of his family and origin, the fourth Gospel, ignoring all this, introduces the great Teacher at once as the Logos who from the beginning was with God and was himself God. The keynote is struck from the first, and in the philosophical prelude to the Gospel we have the announcement to those who have ears to hear, that here we need expect no simple history, but an artistic demonstration of the philosophical postulate. According to the Synoptics, Jesus is baptised by John, and as he goes out of the water the Holy Ghost descends upon him like a dove. The fourth Gospel says nothing of the baptism, and makes John the Baptist narrate vaguely that he saw the Holy Ghost descend like a dove and rest upon Jesus, as a sign previously indicated to him by God by which to recognise the Lamb of God.[1] From the very first, John the Baptist, in the fourth Gospel, recognises and declares Jesus to be "the Christ,"[2] "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world."[3] According to the Synoptics, John comes preaching the baptism of repentance, and so far is he from making such declarations, or forming such distinct opinions concerning Jesus, that even after he has been cast into prison and just before his death—when, in fact, his preaching was at an end -he is represented as sending disciples to Jesus, on hearing in prison of his works, to ask him: "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?"[4] Jesus carries on his ministry and baptises simultaneously with John, according to the fourth Gospel; but his public career, according to the Synoptics, does not begin until after the Baptist's has concluded, and John is cast into prison.[5] The Synoptics clearly represent the ministry of Jesus as having been limited to a single year,[6] and his preaching

[1] John i. 32–33. [2] *Ib.*, i. 15–27. [3] *Ib.*, i. 29.
[4] Matt. xi. 2 f.; cf. Luke vii. 18 f.
[5] John iii. 22; Matt. iv. 12, 17; Mark i. 14; Luke iii. 20, 23; iv. 1 f.
[6] Apologists discover indications of a three years' ministry in Matt. xiii. 37, Luke xiii. 34: "How often," etc.; and also in Luke xiii. 32 f., "to-day, to-morrow, and the third day."

is confined to Galilee and Jerusalem, where his career culminates at the fatal Passover. The fourth Gospel distributes the teaching of Jesus between Galilee, Samaria, and Jerusalem, makes it extend at least over three years, and refers to three Passovers spent by Jesus at Jerusalem.[1] The Fathers felt this difficulty and expended a good deal of apologetic ingenuity upon it; but no one is now content with the explanation of Eusebius, that the Synoptics merely intended to write the history of Jesus during the one year after the imprisonment of the Baptist, whilst the fourth Evangelist recounted the events of the time not recorded by the others—a theory which is totally contradicted by the four Gospels themselves.[2]

The fourth Gospel represents the expulsion of the money-changers by Jesus as taking place at the very outset of his career,[3] when he could not have been known, and when such a proceeding is incredible; whilst the Synoptics place it at the very close of his ministry, after his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, when, if ever, such an act which might have contributed to the final catastrophe becomes conceivable.[4] The variation from the parallels in the Synoptics, moreover, is exceedingly instructive, and further indicates the amplification of a later writer imperfectly acquainted with the circumstances. The first and second Synoptics, in addition to the general expression, "those buying and selling in the Temple," mention only that Jesus overthrew the tables of the money-changers and the seats of those selling doves. The third Synoptist does not even give these particulars. The author of the fourth Gospel, however, not only makes Jesus expel the sellers of doves and the money-changers, but adds: "those selling oxen and sheep." Now, not only is there not the slightest evidence that sheep and oxen were bought and sold in the Temple, but it is obvious that there was no room there to do so. On the contrary, it is known that the market for cattle was not only distant from the Temple, but even from the city. The author himself betrays the foreign element in his account by making Jesus address his words, when driving them all out, only "to them selling doves." Why single these out and seem to exclude the sellers of sheep and oxen? He has apparently forgotten his own interpolation. In the first Gospel the connection of the words of Jesus with the narrative suggests an explanation: xxi. 12 ".....and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats *of those selling doves, and saith to them*," etc. Upon the occasion of this episode the

[1] John ii. 13; vi. 40 f.; vii. 2; xiii. 1.

[2] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 24. We have already referred to the theory of Irenæus, which is at variance with all the Gospels, and extends the career of Jesus to many years of public life.

[3] John ii. 14 f. [4] Matt. xxi. 12 f.; Mark xi. 15 f.; Luke xix. 45 f.

fourth Gospel represents Jesus as replying to the demand of the Jews for a sign why he did such things: "Destroy this temple, and within three days I will raise it up," which the Jews very naturally understand in a material sense, and which even the disciples only comprehended and believed "after the resurrection." The Synoptists not only know nothing of this, but represent the saying as the testimony which the false witnesses bare against Jesus.[1] No such charge is brought against Jesus at all in the fourth Gospel. So little do the Synoptists know of the conversation of Jesus with the Samaritan woman and his sojourn for two days at Sychar that, in his instructions to his disciples in the first Gospel, Jesus positively forbids them either to go to the Gentiles or to enter into any city of the Samaritans.[2]

The fourth Gospel has very few miracles in common with the Synoptics, and those few present notable variations. After the feeding of the five thousand, Jesus, according to the Synoptics, constrains his disciples to enter a ship and to go to the other side of the Lake of Gennesaret, whilst he himself goes up a mountain apart to pray. A storm arises, and Jesus appears walking to them over the sea, whereat the disciples are troubled; but Peter says to him: "Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee over the water"; and on his going out of the ship over the water, and beginning to sink, he cries, "Lord, save me"; Jesus stretched out his hand and caught him; and when they had come into the ship the wind ceased, and they that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying, "Of a truth thou art the Son of God."[3] The fourth Gospel, instead of representing Jesus as retiring to the mountain to pray, which would have been opposed to the author's idea of the Logos, makes the motive for going thither the knowledge of Jesus that the people "would come and take him by force that they might make him a king."[4] The writer altogether ignores the episode of Peter walking on the sea, and adds a new miracle by stating that, as soon as Jesus was received on board, "the ship was at the land whither they were going."[5] The Synoptics go on to describe the devout excitement and faith of all the country round; but the fourth Gospel, limiting the effect on the multitude in the first instance to curiosity as to how Jesus had crossed the lake, represents Jesus as upbraiding them for following him, not because they saw miracles, but because they had eaten of the loaves and been filled,[6] and makes him deliver one of those long dogmatic discourses, interrupted by, and based upon, the remarks of the crowd, which so peculiarly distinguish the fourth Gospel.

[1] John ii. 18 f.; Matt. xxvi. 60 f.; cf. xxvii. 39 f.; Mark xiv. 57 f.; xv. 29.
[2] Matt. x. 5.
[3] Matt. xiv. 22, 23; cf. Mark vi. 46 f.
[4] John vi. 15.
[5] *Ib.*, vi. 17–21.
[6] *Ib.*, vi. 26.

Without dwelling upon such details of miracles, however, we proceed with our slight comparison. Whilst the fourth Gospel from the very commencement asserts the foreknowledge of Jesus as to who should betray him, and makes him inform the Twelve that one of them is a devil, alluding to Judas Iscariot,[1] the Synoptists represent Jesus as having so little foreknowledge that Judas should betray him that, shortly before the end, and indeed, according to the third Gospel, only at the last supper, Jesus promises that the disciples shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel,[2] and it is only at the last supper, after Judas has actually arranged with the chief priests, and apparently from knowledge of the fact, that Jesus, for the first time, speaks of his betrayal by him.[3] On his way to Jerusalem, two days before the Passover,[4] Jesus comes to Bethany, where, according to the Synoptics, being in the house of Simon the leper, a woman with an alabaster box of very precious ointment came and poured the ointment upon his head, much to the indignation of the disciples, who say: "To what purpose is this waste? For this might have been sold for much, and given to the poor."[5] In the fourth Gospel the episode takes place six days before the Passover,[6] in the house of Lazarus, and it is his sister Mary who takes a pound of very costly ointment, but she anoints the feet of Jesus and wipes them with her hair. It is Judas Iscariot, and not the disciples, who says: "Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor?" And Jesus makes a similar reply to that in the Synoptics, showing the identity of the occurrence described so differently.[7]

The Synoptics represent most clearly that Jesus on the evening of the 14th Nisan, after the custom of the Jews, ate the Passover with his disciples,[8] and that he was arrested in the first hours of the 15th Nisan, the day on which he was put to death. Nothing can be more distinct than the statement that the last supper was the Paschal feast. "They made ready the Passover (ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα), and, when the hour was come, he sat down and the Apostles with him, and he said to them: With desire I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer" (Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με

[1] John vi. 64, 70, 71; cf. ii. 25.

[2] Matt. xix. 28; cf. xvii. 22 f.; cf. Mark ix. 30 f., x. 32 f.; Luke xxii. 30; cf. ix. 22 f., 44 f.; xviii. 31 f.

[3] Matt. xxvi. 21 f., cf. 14 f.; Mark xiv. 18 f., cf. 10 f.; Luke xxii. 21 f., cf. 3 f.

[4] Mark xiv. 1.

[5] Matt. xxvi. 6–13; Mark xiv. 3–9.

[6] John xii. 1.

[7] *Ib.*, xii. 1 f.; cf. xi. 2.

[8] Matt. xxvi. 17 f., 19, 36 f., 47 f.; Mark xiv. 12 f., 16 f.; Luke xxii. 7 f., 13 f.

παθεῖν).[1] The fourth Gospel, however, in accordance with the principle which is dominant throughout, represents the last repast which Jesus eats with his disciples as a common supper (δεῖπνον), which takes place not on the 14th, but on the 13th Nisan, the day "before the feast of the Passover" (πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα),[2] and his death takes place on the 14th, the day on which the Paschal lamb was slain. Jesus is delivered by Pilate to the Jews to be crucified about the sixth hour of "the preparation of the Passover" (ἦν παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα),[3] and because it was "the preparation," the legs of the two men crucified with Jesus were broken that the bodies might not remain on the cross on the great day of the feast.[4] The fourth Gospel totally ignores the institution of the Christian festival at the last supper, but, instead, represents Jesus as washing the feet of the disciples, enjoining them also to wash each other's feet: "For I gave you an example that ye should do according as I did to you."[5] The Synoptics have no knowledge of this incident. Immediately after the warning to Peter of his future denial, Jesus goes out with the disciples to the Garden of Gethsemane, and, taking Peter and the two sons of Zebedee apart, began to be sorrowful and very depressed, and, as he prayed in his agony that if possible the cup might pass from him, an angel comforts him. Instead of this, the fourth Gospel represents Jesus as delivering, after the warning to Peter, the longest discourses in the Gospel: "Let not your heart be troubled," etc.; "I am the true vine,"[6] etc.; and although said to be written by one of the sons of Zebedee who were with Jesus on the occasion, the fourth Gospel does not mention the agony in the garden, but, on the contrary, makes Jesus utter the long prayer xvii. 1–26, in a calm and even exulting spirit very far removed from the sorrow and depression of the more natural scene in Gethsemane. The prayer, like the rest of the prayers in the Gospel, is a mere didactic and dogmatic address for the benefit of the hearers.

The arrest of Jesus presents a similar contrast. In the Synoptics, Judas comes with a multitude from the chief priests and elders of the people armed with swords and staves, and, indicating his Master by a kiss, Jesus is simply arrested, and, after the slight resistance of one of the disciples, is led away.[7] In the fourth Gospel the case is very different. Judas comes with a band of men from the chief priests and Pharisees, with lanterns and torches and weapons, and Jesus—"knowing all things which were coming

[1] Luke xxii. 13, 15; cf. Matt. xxvi. 19 f.; Mark xiv. 16 f.
[2] John xiii. 1.
[3] *Ib.*, xix. 14.
[4] *Ib.*, xix. 31 f.
[5] *Ib.*, xiii. 12, 15.
[6] *Ib.*, xiv. 1–31; xv. 1–27; xvi. 1–33; xvii. 1–26.
[7] Matt. xxvi. 47 f.; Mark xiv. 43 f.; Luke xxii. 47 f.

to pass" —himself goes towards them and asks: "Whom seek ye?" Judas plays no active part, and no kiss is given. The fourth Evangelist is, as ever, bent on showing that all which happens to the Logos is predetermined by himself and voluntarily encountered. As soon as Jesus replies, "I am he," the whole band of soldiers go backwards and fall to the ground—an incident thoroughly in the spirit of the early apocryphal Gospels still extant, and of an evidently legendary character. He is then led away first to Annas, who sends him to Caiaphas, whilst the Synoptics naturally know nothing of Annas, who was not the high priest and had no authority. We need not follow the trial, which is fundamentally different in the Synoptics and fourth Gospel; and we have already pointed out that, in the Synoptics, Jesus is crucified on the 15th Nisan, whereas in the fourth Gospel he is put to death—the spiritual Paschal lamb—on the 14th Nisan. According to the fourth Gospel, Jesus bears his own cross to Calvary,[1] but the Synoptics represent it as being borne by Simon of Cyrene.[2] As a very singular illustration of the inaccuracy of all the Gospels, we may point to the circumstance that no two of them agree even about so simple a matter of fact as the inscription on the cross, assuming that there was one at all. They give it respectively as follows: "This is Jesus the King of the Jews"; "The King of the Jews"; "This (is) the King of the Jews"; and the fourth Gospel: "Jesus the Nazarene the King of the Jews."[3] The occurrences during the Crucifixion are profoundly different in the fourth Gospel from those narrated in the Synoptics. In the latter, only the women are represented as beholding afar off,[4] but "the beloved disciple" is added in the fourth Gospel, and, instead of being far off, they are close to the cross; and for the last cries of Jesus reported in the Synoptics we have the episode in which Jesus confides his mother to the disciple's care. We need not at present compare the other details of the Crucifixion and Resurrection, which are differently reported by each of the Gospels.

We have only indicated a few of the more salient differences between the fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, which are rendered much more striking, in the Gospels themselves, by the profound dissimilarity of the sentiments uttered by Jesus. We merely point out, in passing, the omission of important episodes from the fourth Gospel, such as the Temptation in the wilderness; the Trans-

[1] John xix. 17. [2] Matt. xxvii. 32; Mark xv. 21; Luke xxii. 26.

[3] Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Matt xxvii. 37; Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Mark xv. 26; Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος. Luke xxiii. 38; Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. John xix. 19.

[4] Matt. xxvii. 55 f.; Mark xv. 40 f.; Luke xxiii. 49. In this last place all his acquaintance are added.

figuration, at which, according to the Synoptics, the sons of Zebedee were present; the last Supper; the agony in the garden; the mournful cries on the cross; and, we may add, the Ascension; and if we turn to the miracles of Jesus, we find that almost all of those narrated by the Synoptics are ignored, whilst an almost entirely new series is introduced. There is not a single instance of the cure of demoniacal possession in any form recorded in the fourth Gospel. Indeed, the number of miracles is reduced in that Gospel to a few typical cases; and although at the close it is generally said that Jesus did many other signs in the presence of his disciples, these alone are written with the declared purpose: "that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."[1]

We may briefly refer in detail to one miracle of the fourth Gospel—the raising of Lazarus. The extraordinary fact that the Synoptists are utterly ignorant of this the greatest of the miracles attributed to Jesus has been too frequently discussed to require much comment here. It will be remembered that, as the case of the daughter of Jairus is, by the express declaration of Jesus, one of mere suspension of consciousness,[2] the only instance in which a dead person is distinctly said, in any of the Synoptics, to have been restored to life by Jesus is that of the son of the widow of Nain.[3] It is, therefore, quite impossible to suppose that the Synoptists could have known of the raising of Lazarus and wilfully omitted it. It is equally impossible to believe that the authors of the synoptic Gospels, from whatever sources they may have drawn their materials, could have been ignorant of such a miracle had it really taken place. This astounding miracle, according to the fourth Gospel, created such general excitement that it was one of the leading events which led to the arrest and crucifixion of Jesus.[4] If, therefore, the Synoptics had any connection with the writers to whom they are referred, the raising of Lazarus must have been personally known to their reputed authors either directly or through the Apostles who are supposed to have inspired them, or even if they have any claim to contemporary origin the tradition of the greatest miracle of Jesus must have been fresh throughout the Church, if such a wonder had ever been performed. The total ignorance of such a miracle displayed by the whole of the works of the New Testament, therefore, forms the strongest presumptive evidence that the narrative in the fourth Gospel is a mere imaginary scene, illustrative of the dogma, "I am the resurrection and the life," upon which it is based. This conclusion is confirmed by the peculiarities of the narrative itself. When Jesus

[1] John xx. 30 f.
[2] Matt. ix. 24; Mark v. 39; Luke viii. 52.
[3] Luke vii. 11 f.
[4] John xi. 45 f., 53; xii. 9 f., 17 f.

first hears, from the message of the sisters, that Lazarus whom he loved was sick, he declares, xi. 4: "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified thereby"; and v. 6: "When, therefore (οὖν), he heard that he was sick, at that time he continued two days in the place where he was." After that interval he proposes to go into Judæa, and explains to the disciples, v. 11: "Our friend Lazarus is fallen asleep; but I go that I may awake him out of sleep." The disciples reply, with the stupidity with which the fourth Evangelist endows all those who hold colloquy with Jesus, v. 12: "Lord, if he is fallen asleep, he will recover. Howbeit, Jesus spake of his death; but they thought that he was speaking of the taking of rest in sleep. Then said Jesus unto them plainly: Lazarus is dead, and I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent that ye may believe." The artificial nature of all this introductory matter will not have escaped the reader, and it is further illustrated by that which follows. Arrived at Bethany, they find that Lazarus has lain in the grave already four days. Martha says to Jesus (v. 21 f.): "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. And I know that even now whatsoever thou shalt ask of God, God will give thee. Jesus saith unto her: Thy brother shall rise again." Martha, of course, as usual, misunderstands this saying as applying to "the resurrection at the last day," in order to introduce the reply: "I am the resurrection and the life," etc. When they come to the house, and Jesus sees Mary and the Jews weeping, "he groaned in spirit and troubled himself," and on reaching the grave itself (v. 35 f.), "Jesus wept: Then said the Jews: Behold how he loved him!" Now this representation, which has ever since been the admiration of Christendom, presents the very strongest marks of unreality. Jesus, who loves Lazarus so much, disregards the urgent message of the sisters, and, whilst openly declaring that his sickness is not unto death, intentionally lingers until his friend dies. When he does go to Bethany, and is on the very point of restoring Lazarus to life and dissipating the grief of his family and friends, he actually weeps and groans in his spirit. There is so total an absence of reason for such grief at such a moment that these tears, to any sober reader, are unmistakably mere theatrical adjuncts of a scene elaborated out of the imagination of the writer. The suggestion of the bystanders (v. 37), that he might have prevented the death, is not more probable than the continuation (v. 38): "Jesus, therefore, again groaning in himself, cometh to the grave." There, having ordered the stone to be removed, he delivers a prayer avowedly intended merely for the bystanders (v. 41 f.): "And Jesus lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me, and I knew that thou hearest me always: but for the sake of the

multitude which stand around I said this, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." This prayer is as evidently artificial as the rest of the details of the miracle; but, as in other elaborately arranged scenic representations, the charm is altogether dispelled when closer examination shows the character of the dramatic elements. A careful consideration of the narrative and of all the facts of the case must, we think, lead to the conclusion that this miracle is not even a historical tradition of the life of Jesus, but is wholly an ideal composition by the author of the fourth Gospel. This being the case, the other miracles of the Gospel need not detain us.

If the historical part of the fourth Gospel be in irreconcilable contradiction to the Synoptics, the didactic is infinitely more so. The teaching of the one is totally different from that of the others in spirit, form, and terminology; and, although there are undoubtedly fine sayings throughout the work, in the prolix discourses of the fourth Gospel there is not a single characteristic of the simple eloquence of the Sermon on the Mount. In the diffuse mysticism of the Logos we can scarcely recognise a trace of the terse practical wisdom of Jesus of Nazareth. It must be apparent even to the most superficial observer that, in the fourth Gospel, we are introduced to a perfectly new system of instruction, and to an order of ideas of which there is not a vestige in the Synoptics. Instead of short and concise lessons, full of striking truth and point, we find nothing but long and involved dogmatic discourses of little practical utility. The limpid spontaneity of that earlier teaching, with its fresh illustrations and profound sentences, uttered without effort and untinged by art, is exchanged for diffuse addresses and artificial dialogues, in which labour and design are everywhere apparent. From pure and living morality, couched in brief, incisive sayings which enter the heart and dwell upon the ear, we turn to elaborate philosophical orations without clearness or order, and to doctrinal announcements unknown to the Synoptics. To the inquiry, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Jesus replies, in the Synoptics, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself.....this do, and thou shalt live."[1] In the fourth Gospel, to the question, "What must we do that we may work the works of God?" Jesus answers, "This is the work of God, that ye should believe in him whom he sent."[2] The teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics is almost wholly moral, and in the fourth Gospel it is almost wholly dogmatic. If Christianity consist of the doctrines preached in the fourth Gospel, it is not too much to say that the Synoptics do not

[1] Luke x. 25–28; cf. Mark xix. 16 f.; xxii. 36–40. [2] John vi. 28, 29.

teach Christianity at all. The extraordinary phenomenon is presented of three Gospels, each professing to be complete in itself, and to convey the good tidings of salvation to man, which have actually omitted the doctrines which are the condition of that salvation. The fourth Gospel practically expounds a new religion. It is undeniable that morality and precepts of love and charity for the conduct of life are the staple of the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics, and that dogma occupies so small a place that it is regarded as a subordinate and secondary consideration. In the fourth Gospel, however, dogma is the one thing needful, and forms the whole substance of the preaching of the Logos. The burden of his teaching is, "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life, but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."[1] It is scarcely possible to put the contrast between the Synoptics and the fourth Gospel in too strong a light. If we possessed the Synoptics without the fourth Gospel, we should have the exposition of pure morality based on perfect love to God and man. If we had the fourth Gospel without the Synoptics, we should have little more than a system of dogmatic theology without morality. Not only is the doctrine and the terminology of the Jesus of the fourth Gospel quite different from that of the Jesus of the Synoptics, but so is the teaching of John the Baptist. In the Synoptics he comes preaching the Baptism of repentance,[2] and, like the Master, inculcating principles of morality;[3] but in the fourth Gospel he has adopted the peculiar views of the author, proclaims "the lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world,"[4] and bears witness that he is "the Son of God."[5] We hear of the Paraclete for the first time in the fourth Gospel.

It is so impossible to ignore the distinct individuality of the Jesus of the fourth Gospel, and of his teaching, that even Apologists are obliged to admit that the peculiarities of the author have coloured the portrait, and introduced an element of subjectivity into the discourses. It was impossible, they confess, that the Apostle could remember verbally such long orations for half a century, and at best that they can only be accepted as substantially correct reports of the teaching of Jesus. "Above all," says Ewald, "the discourses of Christ and of others in this Gospel are clothed as by an entirely new colour: on this account also scepticism has desired to conclude that the Apostle cannot have composed the Gospel; and yet no conclusion is more unfounded. When the Apostle at so late a period determined to compose the work, it was certainly impossible for him to reproduce all the

[1] John iii. 36. [2] Matt. iii. 1 f.; Mark i. 4 f.; Luke iii. 2 f.
[3] Luke iii. 8, 10 f. [4] John i. 29, 36. [5] *Ib.*, i. 34.

words exactly as they were spoken, if he did not perhaps desire not merely to recall a few memorable sentences, but, in longer discussions of more weighty subjects, to charm back all the animation with which they were once given. So he availed himself of that freedom in their revivification which is quite intelligible in itself, and sufficiently warranted by the precedent of so many great examples of antiquity; and where the discourses extend to greater length, there entered involuntarily into the structure much of that fundamental conception and language regarding the manifestation of Christ which had long become deeply rooted in the Apostle's soul. But as certainly as these discourses bear upon them the colouring of the Apostle's mind, so certainly do they agree in their substantial contents with his best recollections because the Spruchsammlung proves that the discourses of Christ in certain moments really could rise to the full elevation, which in John surprises us throughout more than in Matthew. To deny the apostolical authorship of the Gospel for such reasons, therefore, were pure folly, and in the highest degree unjust. Moreover, the circumstance that, in the drawing up of such discourses, we sometimes see him reproduce or further develop sayings which had already been recorded in the older Gospels, can prove nothing against the apostolical origin of the Gospel, as he was indeed at perfect liberty, if he pleased, to make use of the contents of such older writings when he considered it desirable, and when they came to the help of his own memory of those long passed days: for he certainly retained many or all of such expressions also in his own memory."[1] Elsewhere, he describes the work as "glorified Gospel history," composed out of "glorified recollection."[2]

Another strenuous defender of the authenticity of the fourth Gospel wrote of it as follows: "Nevertheless, everything is reconcilable," says Gfrörer, "if one accept the testimony of the elders as true. For as John must have written the Gospel as an old man, that is to say not before the year 90-95 of our era, there is an interval of more than half a century between the time when the events which he relates really happened and the time of the composition of his book—space enough certainly to make a few mistakes conceivable, even pre-supposing a good memory and unshaken love of truth. Let us imagine, for instance, that to-day (in 1841) an old man of eighty to ninety years of age should write down from mere memory the occurrences of the American War (of Independence), in which he himself in his early youth played

[1] *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, x., p. 90 f.

[2] "*Verklarte evangelische Geschichte*"—"*verklärte erinnerung*" (*Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, iii., pp. 163, 166).

a part. Certainly in his narrative, even though it might otherwise be true, many traits would be found which would not agree with the original event. Moreover, another particular circumstance must be added in connection with the fourth Gospel. Two-thirds of it consist of discourses, which John places in the mouth of Jesus Christ. Now, every day's experience proves that oral impressions are much more fleeting than those of sight. The happiest memory scarcely retains long orations after three or four years: how, then, could John with verbal accuracy report the discourses of Jesus after fifty or sixty years! We must be content if he truly render the chief contents and spirit of them, and that he does this, as a rule, can be proved. It has been shown above that already, before Christ, a very peculiar philosophy of religion had been formed among the Egyptian Jews, which found its way into Palestine through the Essenes, and also numbered numerous adherents amongst the Jews of the adjacent countries of Syria and Asia Minor. The Apostle Paul professed this: not less the Evangelist John. Undoubtedly, the latter allowed this Theosophy to exercise a strong influence upon his representation of the life-history of Jesus,"[1] etc.

All such admissions, whilst they are absolutely requisite to explain the undeniable phenomena of the fourth Gospel, have one obvious consequence: The fourth Gospel, by whomsoever written—even if it could be traced to the Apostle John himself—has no real historical value, being at best the "glorified recollections" of an old man, written down half a century after the events recorded. The absolute difference between the teaching of this Gospel and of the Synoptics becomes perfectly intelligible when the long discourses are recognised to be the result of Alexandrian philosophy artistically interwoven with developed Pauline Christianity, and put into the mouth of Jesus. It will have been remarked that along with the admission of great subjectivity in the report of the discourses, and the plea that nothing beyond the mere substance of the original teaching can reasonably be looked for, there is, in the extracts we have given, an assertion that there actually is a faithful reproduction in this Gospel of the original substance. There is not a shadow of proof of this, but, on the contrary, the strongest reason for denying the fact; for, unless it be admitted that the Synoptics have so completely omitted the whole doctrinal part of the teaching of Jesus, have so carefully avoided the very peculiar terminology of the Logos Gospel, and have conveyed so unhistorical and erroneous an impression of the life and religious system of Jesus that, without the fourth Gospel, we should not actually have had

[1] Gfrörer, *Allg. K. G.*, 1841, i., p. 172 f.

an idea of his fundamental doctrines, we must inevitably recognise that the fourth Gospel cannot possibly be a true reproduction of his teaching. It is impossible that Jesus can have had two such diametrically opposed systems of teaching—one purely moral, the other wholly dogmatic; one expressed in wonderfully terse, clear, brief sayings and parables; the other in long, involved, and diffuse discourses; one clothed in the great language of humanity, the other concealed in obscure philosophic terminology—and that these should have been kept so distinct as they are in the Synoptics on the one hand, and the fourth Gospel on the other. The tradition of Justin Martyr applies solely to the system of the Synoptics: "Brief and concise were the sentences uttered by him, for he was no Sophist, but his word was the power of God."[1]

We have already pointed out the evident traces of artificial construction in the discourses and dialogues of the fourth Gospel, and the more closely these are examined the more clear does it become that they are not genuine reports of the teaching of Jesus, but mere ideal compositions by the author of the fourth Gospel. The speeches of John the Baptist, the discourses of Jesus, and the reflections of the Evangelist himself,[2] are marked by the same peculiarity of style and proceed from the same mind. It is scarcely possible to determine where the one begins and the other ends.[3] It is quite clear, for instance, that the author himself without a break continues the words which he puts into the mouth of Jesus, in the colloquy with Nicodemus, but it is not easy to determine where. The whole dialogue is artificial in the extreme, and is certainly not genuine; and this is apparent not only from the replies attributed to the "teacher of Israel," but to the irrelevant manner in which the reflections loosely ramble from the new birth to the dogmatic statements in the thirteenth and following verses, which are the never-failing resource of the Evangelist when other subjects are exhausted. The sentiments and almost the words attributed to Jesus, or added by the writer, to which we are now referring, iii. 12 f., we find again in the very same chapter, either put into the mouth of John the Baptist, or as reflections of the author, verses 31–36, for again we add that it is difficult anywhere to discriminate the speaker. Indeed, while the Synoptics are rich in the abundance of practical counsel and profound moral insight, as well as in variety of illustrative parables, it is remarkable how much sameness there is in all the discourses of the fourth Gospel, a very few ideas being constantly reproduced. Whilst the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics is singularly universal and impersonal, in the fourth Gospel it is purely personal, and rarely passes beyond the declaration

[1] *Apol.*, i. 14. [2] John i. 1–18, etc. [3] Cf. *ib.*, i. 15 f.; iii. 27 f., 10–21.

of his own dignity, and the inculcation of belief in him as the only means of salvation. There are certainly some sayings of rare beauty which tradition or earlier records may have preserved, but these may easily be distinguished from the mass of the work. A very distinct trace of ideal composition is found in xvii. 3: "And this is eternal life, to know thee the only true God and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ." Even Apologists admit that it is impossible that Jesus could speak of himself as "Jesus Christ." We need not, however, proceed further with such analysis. We believe that no one can calmly and impartially examine the fourth Gospel without being convinced of its artificial character. If some portions possess real charm, it is of a purely ideal kind, and their attraction consists chiefly in the presence of a certain vague but suggestive mysticism. The natural longing of humanity for any revelation regarding a future state has not been appealed to in vain. That the diffuse and often monotonous discourses of this Gospel should ever have been preferred to the grand simplicity of the teaching of the Synoptics, illustrated by such parables as the wise and foolish virgins, the sower, and the Prodigal Son, and culminating in the Sermon on the Mount, each sentence of which is so full of truth and beauty, is little to the credit of critical sense and judgment.

The elaborate explanations by which the phenomena of the fourth Gospel are reconciled with the assumption that it was composed by the Apostle John are in vain, and there is not a single item of evidence within the first century and a half which does not agree with internal testimony in opposing the supposition. To one point we must briefly refer in connection with this statement. It is asserted that the Gospel and Epistles—or at least the first Epistle—of the Canon ascribed to the Apostle John are by one author, although this is not without contradiction, and very many of those who agree as to the identity of authorship by no means admit the author to have been the Apostle John. It is argued, therefore, that the use of the Epistle by Polycarp and Papias is evidence of the apostolic origin of the Gospel. We have, however, seen that not only is it very uncertain that Polycarp made use of the Epistle at all, but that he does not in any case mention its author's name. There is not a particle of evidence that he ascribed the Epistle, even supposing he knew it, to the Apostle John. With regard to Papias, the only authority for the assertion that he knew the Epistle is the statement of Eusebius already quoted and discussed, that "He used testimonies out of John's first Epistle."[1] There is no evidence, even supposing the statement of Eusebius to be correct, that he

[1] *H. E.*, v. 8.

ascribed it to the Apostle. The earliest undoubted references to the Epistle, in fact, are by Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria, so that this evidence is of little avail for the Gospel. There is no name attached to the first Epistle, and the second and third have the superscription of "the Presbyter," which, applying the argument of Ewald regarding the author of the Apocalypse, ought to be conclusive against their being written by an Apostle. As all three are evidently by the same writer, and intended to be understood as by the author of the Gospel, and that writer does not pretend to be an Apostle but calls himself a simple Presbyter, the Epistles likewise give presumptive evidence against the Apostolic authorship of the Gospel.

There is another important testimony against the Johannine origin of the fourth Gospel to which we must briefly refer. We have pointed out that, according to the fourth Gospel, Jesus did not eat the Paschal Supper with his disciples, but that, being arrested on the 13th Nisan, he was put to death on the 14th, the actual day upon which the Paschal lamb was sacrificed. The Synoptics, on the contrary, represent that Jesus ate the Passover with his disciples on the evening of the 14th, and was crucified on the 15th Nisan. The difference of opinion indicated by these contradictory accounts actually prevailed in various Churches, and in the second half of the second century a violent discussion arose as to the day upon which "The true Passover of the Lord" should be celebrated, the Church in Asia Minor maintaining that it should be observed on the 14th Nisan—the day on which, according to the Synoptics, Jesus himself celebrated the Passover and instituted the Christian festival; whilst the Roman Church as well as most other Christians—following the fourth Gospel, which represents Jesus as not celebrating the last Passover, but being himself slain upon the 14th Nisan, the true Paschal lamb—had abandoned the day of the Jewish feast altogether, and celebrated the Christian festival on Easter Sunday, upon which the Resurrection was supposed to have taken place. Polycarp, who went to Rome to represent the Churches of Asia Minor in the discussions upon the subject, could not be induced to give up the celebration on the 14th Nisan, the day which, according to tradition, had always been observed, and he appealed to the practice of the Apostle John himself in support of that date. Eusebius quotes from Irenæus the statement of the case: "For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe it (the 14th Nisan), because he had ever observed it with John the disciple of our Lord, and with the rest of the Apostles with whom he consorted."[1] Towards the end of

[1] Οὔτε γάρ ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὸν Πολύκαρπον πεῖσαι ἐδύνατο μὴ τηρεῖν, ἅτε μετὰ Ἰωάννου τοῦ μαθητοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων οἷς συνδιέτριψεν, ἀεὶ τετηρηκότα, κ.τ.λ. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 4; Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 24.

the century Polycrates, the Bishop of Ephesus, likewise appeals to the practice of "John who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord," as well as of the Apostle Philip and his daughters, and of Polycarp and others, in support of the same day. "All these observed the 14th day of the Passover, according to the Gospel, deviating from it in no respect, but following according to the rule of the faith."[1] Now it is evident that, according to this undoubted testimony, the Apostle John, by his own practice, ratified the account of the Synoptics, and contradicted the data of the fourth Gospel; and upon the supposition that he so long lived in Asia Minor it is probable that his authority largely contributed to establish the observance of the 14th Nisan there. We must, therefore, either admit that the Apostle John by his practice reversed the statement of his own Gospel, or that he was not its author, which of course is the natural conclusion. Without going further into the discussion, which would detain us too long, it is clear that the Paschal controversy is opposed to the supposition that the Apostle John was the author of the fourth Gospel.

We have seen that, whilst there is not one particle of evidence during a century and a half after the events recorded in the fourth Gospel that it was composed by the son of Zebedee, there is, on the contrary, the strongest reason for believing that he did not write it. The first writer who quotes a passage of the Gospel with the mention of his name is Theophilus of Antioch, who gives the few words, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God," as spoken by "John," whom he considers amongst the divinely inspired (*οἱ πνευματοφόροι*),[2] though even he does not distinguish him as the Apostle. We have seen the legendary nature of the late traditions regarding the composition of the Gospel, of which a specimen was given in the defence of it in the Canon of Muratori, and we must not further quote them. The first writer who distinctly classes the four Gospels together is Irenæus; and the reasons which he gives for the existence of precisely that number in the Canon of the Church illustrate the thoroughly uncritical character of the Fathers, and the slight dependence which can be placed upon their judgment. "But neither can the Gospels be more in number than they are," says Irenæus, "nor, on the other hand, can they be fewer. For as there are four quarters of the world in which we are, and four general winds (*καθολικὰ πνεύματα*), and the Church is disseminated throughout all the world, and the Gospel is the pillar and

[1] Οὗτοι πάντες ἐτήρησαν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης τοῦ πάσχα κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, μηδὲν παρεκβαίνοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς πίστεως ἀκολουθοῦντες. Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 24.

[2] *Ad Autolyc.*, ii., 22. Tischendorf dates this work about A.D. 180 (*Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 16, anm. 1).

prop of the Church and the spirit of life, it is right that she should have four pillars on all sides breathing out immortality and revivifying men. From which it is manifest that the Word, the maker of all, he who sitteth upon the Cherubim and containeth all things, who was manifested to man, has given to us the Gospel four-formed but possessed by one spirit; as David also says, supplicating his advent: 'Thou that sittest between the Cherubim, shine forth.' For the Cherubim also are four-faced, and their faces are symbols of the working of the Son of God.....and the Gospels, therefore, are in harmony with these amongst which Christ is seated. For the Gospel according to John relates his first effectual and glorious generation from the Father, saying: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God,' and 'all things were made by him, and without him nothing was made.' On this account also this Gospel is full of all trustworthiness, for such is his person.[1] But the Gospel according to Luke, being as it were of priestly character, opened with Zacharias the priest sacrificing to God..... But Matthew narrates his generation as a man, saying: 'The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham,' and 'the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise.' This Gospel, therefore, is anthropomorphic, and on this account a man, humble and mild in character, is presented throughout the Gospel. But Mark makes his commencement after a prophetic Spirit coming down from on high unto men, saying: 'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as it is written in Isaiah the prophet'; indicating the winged form of the Gospel; and for this reason he makes a compendious and precursory declaration, for this is the prophetic character.....Such, therefore, as was the course of the Son of God, such also is the form of the living creatures; and such as is the form of the living creatures, such also is the character of the Gospel. For quadriform are the living creatures, quadriform is the Gospel, and quadriform the course of the Lord. And on this account four covenants were given to the human race.....These things being thus: vain and ignorant and, moreover, audacious are those who set aside the form of the Gospel, and declare the aspects of the Gospels as either more or less than has been said."[2] As such principles of criticism presided over the formation of the Canon, it is not singular that so many of the decisions of the Fathers have been reversed. Irenæus himself mentioned the existence of heretics who rejected the fourth

[1] The Greek of this rather unintelligible sentence is not preserved. The Latin version reads as follows: *Propter hoc et omni fiducia plenum est Evangelium istud; talis est enim persona ejus.*

[2] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 11, §§ 8, 9.

Gospel,[1] and Epiphanius[2] refers to the Alogi, who equally denied its authenticity; but it is not needful for us further to discuss this point. Enough has been said to show that the testimony of the fourth Gospel is of no value towards establishing the truth of miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation.

[1] *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 2, § 9.

[2] *Hær.*, li. 3, 4, 28.

PART IV.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

CHAPTER I.

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

Before we proceed to examine the evidence for miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation which is furnished by the last historical book of the New Testament, entitled the "Acts of the Apostles," it is well that we should briefly recall to mind some characteristics of the document, which most materially affect the value of any testimony emanating from it. Whilst generally asserting the resurrection of Jesus, and his bodily ascension, regarding which indeed it adds fresh details, this work presents to us a new cycle of miracles, and so profusely introduces supernatural agency into the history of the early Church that, in comparison with it, the Gospels seem almost sober narratives. The Apostles are instructed and comforted by visions and revelations, and they, and all who believe, are filled with the Holy Spirit and speak with other tongues. The Apostles are delivered from prison and from bonds by angels or by an earthquake. Men fall dead or are smitten with blindness at their rebuke. They heal the sick, raise the dead, and handkerchiefs brought from their bodies cure diseases and expel evil spirits.

As a general rule, any document so full of miraculous episodes and supernatural occurrences would, without hesitation, be characterised as fabulous and incredible, and would not, by any sober-minded reader, be for a moment accepted as historical. There is no other testimony for these miracles. Let the reader endeavour to form some conception of the nature and amount of evidence necessary to establish the truth of statements antecedently so incredible, and compare it with the testimony of this solitary and anonymous document, the character and value of which we shall now proceed more closely to examine.

It is generally admitted, and indeed it is undeniable, that no distinct and unequivocal reference to the Acts of the Apostles, and to Luke as their author, occurs in the writings of Fathers before one by Irenæus[1] about the end of the second century. Passages are, however, pointed out in early writings as indicating the use and consequent existence of our document, all of which we shall now examine.

Several of these occur in the *Epistle to the Corinthians*, ascribed to Clement of Rome. The first, immediately compared with the passage to which it is supposed to be a reference, is as follows :—

Epistle, c. ii.	Acts xx. 35.
Ye were all humble-minded, not boasting at all, subjecting yourselves rather than subjecting others, more gladly giving than receiving.	.....and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, that he himself said : It is more blessed to give than to receive.
Πάντες τε ἐταπεινοφρονεῖτε, μηδὲν ἀλαζονευόμενοι, ὑποτασσόμενοι, μᾶλλον ἢ ὑποτάσσοντες, ἥδιον διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες.....	*.....μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν· Μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν.*

The words of the Epistle are not a quotation, but merely occur in the course of an address. They do not take the form of an axiom, but are a comment on the conduct of the Corinthians, which may have been suggested either by written or oral tradition, or by moral maxims long before current in heathen philosophy.[2] It is unnecessary to enter minutely into this, however, or to indicate the linguistic differences between the two passages, for one point alone settles the question. In the Acts the saying, "It is more blessed to give than to receive," is distinctly introduced as a quotation of "words of the Lord Jesus," and the exhortation "to remember" them conveys the inference that they were well known. They must either have formed part of Gospels now no longer extant, as they are not found in ours, or have been familiar as the unwritten tradition of sayings of the Master. In either case, if the passage in the Epistle be a reference to these words at all, it cannot reasonably be maintained that it must necessarily have been derived from a work which itself distinctly quotes the words from another source. The slight coincidence in the expression, without indication that any particular

[1] *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 14, §§ 1, 2.

[2] Εὖ ποιεῖν ἥδιόν ἐστι τοῦ πάσχειν. Epicur. ap. Plut., *Mor.*, p. 778 c. *Errat enim si quis beneficium libentius accipit quam reddit.* Seneca, *Epist.*, lxxxi. 17. Μᾶλλόν ἐστι τοῦ ἐλευθερίου τὸ διδόναι οἷς δεῖ ἢ λαμβάνειν ὅθεν δεῖ, καὶ μὴ λαμβάνειν ὅθεν οὐ δεῖ. τῆς γὰρ ἀρετῆς μαλλον τὸ εὖ ποιεῖν ἢ τὸ εὖ πάσχειν. Aristotle, *Eth. Nicom.*, iv. 1. Δωρεῖσθαι καὶ διδόναι κρεῖττον ἢ λαμβάνειν. Artemidor., *Oneirocr.*, iv. 3. Cf. Wetstein, *N. T. Gr.*, *l. c.*

passage is in the mind of the author, and without any mention of the Acts, is no evidence of the existence of that work.

A few critics point to some parts of the following passage as showing acquaintance with Acts: "Through jealousy Paul also pointed out the way to the prize of patience, having borne chains seven times, having been put to flight, having been stoned; having become a preacher both in the East and in the West, he gained the noble renown due to his faith; having taught the whole world righteousness, and come to the extremity of the West, and having suffered martyrdom by command of the rulers, he was thus removed from the world and went to the holy place, having become a most eminent example of patience."[1] The slightest impartial consideration, however, must convince any one that this passage does not indicate the use of the Acts of the Apostles. The Epistle speaks of seven imprisonments, of some of which the Acts make no mention, and this must, therefore, have been derived from another source. The reference to his "coming to the extremity of the West" (*τέρμα τῆς δύσεως*), whatever interpretation be put upon it, and to his death, obviously carries the history further than the Acts, and cannot have been derived from that document.

The last passage which, it is affirmed, shows acquaintance with the Acts of the Apostles is the following: "But what shall we say regarding David who hath obtained a good report (*ἐπὶ τῷ μεμαρτυρημένῳ Δαυείδ*)? unto whom (*πρὸς ὃν*) God said: 'I found a man after mine own heart, David the son of Jesse: in everlasting mercy I anointed him.'"[2] This is said to be derived from Acts xiii. 22: "And when he removed him he raised up to them David for king; to whom also he gave testimony (*ᾧ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας*): I found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine own heart, who will do all my will."[3] The passage, however, is compounded of two quotations loosely made from the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, from which all the quotations in the Epistle are taken. Ps. lxxxviii. 20: "I found David my servant; in holy mercy I anointed him."[4] And 1 Sam. xiii. 14: "A man after his own heart."[5] Clement of Alexandria quotes this passage from the Epistle, and for "in everlasting mercy" reads "with holy oil" (*ἐν ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ*) as in the Psalm.[6] Although, therefore,

[1] C. v. [2] C. xviii.

[3] *Καὶ μεταστήσας αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν τὸν Δαυεὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς βασιλέα, ᾧ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας· Εὗρον Δαυεὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου.* Acts xiii. 22.

[4] *Εὗρον Δαυὶδ τὸν δοῦλόν μου, ἐν ἐλέει ἁγίῳ ἔχρισα αὐτόν.* The Alexandrian MS. reads *ἐν ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ μου.* The quotation given is the reading of the *Vatican Codex.*

[5] *ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ.*

[6] *Stromata,* iv. 17.

our Alexandrian MS. of the Epistle has the reading which we have given above, even if we suppose that the Alexandrian Clement may have found a more correct version in his MS., the argument would not be affected. The whole similarity lies in the insertion of "the son of Jesse," but this was a most common addition to any mention of David, and by the completion of the passage from the Psalm, the admission of "who will do all my will," the peculiar phrase of the Acts, as well as the difference of introductory expressions, any connection between the two is severed, and it is apparent that the quotation of the Epistle may legitimately be referred to the Septuagint, with which it agrees much more closely than with the Acts. In no case could such slight coincidences prove acquaintance with the Acts of the Apostles.[1]

Only one passage of the *Epistle of Barnabas* is referred to by any one as indicating acquaintance with the Acts. It is as follows, c. 7: "If therefore the son of God, being Lord, and about to judge quick and dead (*καὶ μέλλων κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς*), suffered," etc. This is compared with Acts x. 42....."and to testify that it is he who has been appointed by God judge of quick and dead" (*ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ὡρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν*). Lardner, who compares the expression of the Epistle with Acts, equally compares it with that in 2 Tim. iv. 1..... "and Christ Jesus who is about to judge the quick and dead" (*μέλλοντος κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς*), to which it is more commonly referred,[2] and 1 Pet. iv. 5....."to him who is ready to judge quick and dead" (*κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς*). He adds, however: "It is not possible to say what text he refers to, though that in Timothy has the same words. But perhaps there is no proof that he refers to any. This was an article known to every common Christian; whereas this writer (whoever he be) was able to teach the Christian religion, and that without respect to any written gospels or epistles."[3] It is scarcely necessary to add anything to this. There is, of course, no trace of the use of Acts in the Epistle.

It is asserted that there is a "clear allusion"[4] to Acts in the

[1] Alford, *Greek Test.*, ii., *Proleg.*, p. 20; Eichhorn, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 72 f.; Hilgenfeld, *Ap. Vater*, p. 108; Neudecker, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 357, anm. 2; Zeller, *Apg.*, p. 9. Dr. Westcott does not claim any (*On the Canon*, 1875, p. 48, note 2). Dr. Lightfoot simply assigns the reference to the Psalm and 1 Sam. xiii. 14.

[2] Cf. Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 48, n. 2. (The references to Dr. Westcott's work on the Canon up to the present point are always to the 2nd ed., 1866, and those henceforward to the 4th ed., 1875, except where otherwise specified.)

[3] *Credibility*, etc., *Works*, 1788, ii., p. 17. Dr. Lightfoot does not suggest any reference here to Acts.

[4] Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 198 f.

Shepherd of Hermas. The passages may be compared as follows :—

Vis. iv. 2.	Acts iv. 12.
.....and didst open thy heart to the Lord, believing that by no other couldst thou be saved than by the great and glorious name.	And there is salvation in no other : for neither is there any other name under the heaven that has been given among men whereby we must be saved.
.....καὶ τὴν καρδίαν σου ἤνοιξας πρὸς τὸν κύριον, πιστεύσας ὅτι δι' οὐδενὸς δύνῃ σωθῆναι εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ἐνδόξου ὀνόματος.	καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενὶ ἡ σωτηρία· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς.

The slightest comparison of these passages suffices to show that the one is not dependent on the other. The Old Testament is full of passages in which the name of the Lord is magnified as the only source of safety and salvation. In the Pauline Epistles likewise there are numerous passages of a similar tenour. For instance, the passage from Joel ii. 32 is quoted Rom. x. 13 : "For whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται).[1] There was, in fact, no formula more current either amongst the Jews or in the early Church ; and there is no legitimate ground for tracing such an expression to the Acts of the Apostles.

The only other passage which is quoted[2] as indicating acquaintance with Acts is the following, which we at once contrast with the supposed parallel :—

Simil. ix. 28.	Acts v. 41.
But ye who suffer on account of the name ought to praise God, that God deemed ye worthy to bear his name, and that all your sins may be redeemed.	So they departed rejoicing from the presence of the council that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name.
ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ πάσχοντες ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος δοξάζειν ὀφείλετε τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ἀξίους ὑμᾶς ἠγήσατο ὁ θεὸς ἵνα τούτου τὸ ὄνομα βαστάζητε, καὶ πᾶσαι ὑμῶν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἰαθῶσιν.	οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ συνεδρίου, ὅτι κατηξιώθησαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀτιμασθῆναι.

Here again a formula is employed which is common throughout the New Testament, and which, applied as it is here to those who were persecuted, we have reason to believe was in general use in the early Church. It is almost unnecessary to point out any examples. Everywhere "the name" of God or of Jesus is the

[1] The same passage is quoted, Acts ii. 21. Cf. Ephes. i. 20, 21 ; Philip. ii. 9 f. ; 1 John v. 13 f.

[2] Lardner, *Works*, ii., p. 56. This is not advanced by Kirchhofer, nor does Dr. Westcott refer to it. Even Hefele does not suggest a reference.

symbol used to represent the concrete idea, and in the heavenly Jerusalem of the Apocalypse the servants of God and of the Lamb are to have "his name" on their foreheads. The one expression, however, which is peculiar in the passage: "counted worthy"—in the Acts καταξιώθησαν, and in the *Shepherd* ἀξίους ἡγήσατο—is a perfectly natural and simple one, the use of which cannot be exclusively conceded to the Acts of the Apostles. It is found frequently in the Pauline Epistles, as for instance in 2 Thes. i. 5, where, after saying that they give thanks to God for them and glory in the churches of God for the patience and faith with which the Thessalonians endure persecutions, the writer continues: "which is a token of the righteous judgment of God, that ye *may be counted worthy* (καταξιωθῆναι) of the kingdom of God, for which ye also *suffer* (πάσχετε)"; and again, in the same chapter, v. 11, 12, "Wherefore we also pray always for you that our God *may count you worthy* (ἀξιώσῃ) of the calling, and fulfil all good pleasure of goodness and work of faith with power; *that the name of our Lord Jesus may be glorified in you* (ἐνδοξασθῇ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν)," etc. The passage we are examining cannot be traced to the "Acts of the Apostles." It must be obvious to all that the *Shepherd* of Hermas does not present any evidence even of the existence of the Acts at the time it was written.

Only two passages in the *Epistles of Pseudo-Ignatius* are pointed out as indicating acquaintance with the Acts, and even these are not advanced by many critics. We have already so fully discussed these Epistles that no more need now be said. We must pronounce them spurious in all their recensions, and incapable of affording evidence upon any point earlier than towards the end of the second century. We might, therefore, altogether refuse to examine the passages; but, in order to show the exact nature of the case made out by apologists, we shall briefly refer to them. We at once compare the first with its supposed parallel[1]:—

Ep. to Smyrn. iii.	Acts x. 41.
But after the resurrection he did eat and drink with them, as in the flesh, although spiritually united to the Father.	.....even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.
Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικὸς, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος τῷ πατρί.	.....ἡμῖν οἵτινες συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν·

There is nothing in this passage which bears any peculiar analogy to the Acts, for the statement is a simple reference to a

[1] Dr. Westcott does not claim either this or the second (*On the Canon*, p. 48, note 2), and Hefele merely suggests comparison with Acts (*Patr. Ap.*, p. 103, p. 98).

tradition which is also embodied both in the third Synoptic[1] and in the fourth Gospel;[2] and the mere use of the common words *φάγειν* and *πίνειν* could not prove anything. The passage occurs in the Epistle immediately after a quotation, said by Jerome to be taken from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, relating an appearance of Jesus to "those who were with Peter," in which Jesus is represented as making them handle him in order to convince them that he is not an incorporeal spirit.[3] The quotation bears considerable affinity to the narrative in the third Synoptic (xxiv. 39), at the close of which Jesus is represented as eating with the disciples. It is highly probable that the Gospel from which the writer of the Epistle quoted contained the same detail, to which this would naturally be a direct descriptive reference. In any case, it affords no evidence of the existence of the Acts of the Apostles.

The second passage, which is still more rarely advanced, is as follows:—

Ep. to Philad. ii.	Acts xx. 29.
For many wolves (which appear) worthy of belief, make captive by evil pleasure the runners in the course of God.	I know that after my departing grievous wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock.
πολλοὶ γὰρ λύκοι ἀξιόπιστοι ἡδονῇ κακῇ αἰχμαλωτίζουσιν τοὺς θεοδρόμους.	*ἐγὼ οἶδα ὅτι εἰσελεύσονται μετὰ τὴν ἄφιξίν μου λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου.*

The only point of coincidence between these two passages is the use of the word "wolves." In the Epistle the expression is *πολλοὶ λύκοι ἀξιόπιστοι*, whilst in Acts it is *λύκοι βαρεῖς*. Now, the image is substantially found in the Sermon on the Mount, one form of which is given in the first Synoptic, vii. 15, 16, and which undeniably must have formed part of many of the Gospels which are mentioned by the writer of the third Synoptic. We find Justin Martyr twice quoting another form of the saying, "For many (*πολλοὶ*) shall arrive in my name, outwardly, indeed, clothed in sheep's skins, but inwardly being ravening wolves (*λύκοι ἅρπαγες*)."[4] The use of the term as applied to men was certainly common in the early Church. The idea expressed in the Epistle is more closely found in 2 Timothy iii. 1 f., in the description of those who are to come in the last days, and who will (v. 6) "creep into the houses and make captive (*αἰχμαλωτίζοντες*) silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts." The passage cannot be traced to the Acts, and the Ignatian Epistles, spurious though they be, do not present any evidence of the existence of that work.

[1] Luke xxiv. 42 f. [2] John xxi. 12 f. [3] Quoted p. 173 f.
[4] See discussion of the quotation, p. 228, note 1, p. 238 f.

Only two sentences are pointed out in the *Epistle of Polycarp* as denoting acquaintance with the Acts. The first and only one of these on which much stress is laid is the following :—

Epistle i.	Acts ii. 24.
Whom God raised (ἤγειρεν), having loosed the pains of hell (ᾅδου).	Whom God raised up (ἀνέστησεν), having loosed the pains of death (θανάτου).

It will be obvious to all that, along with much similarity, there is likewise divergence between these sentences. In the first phrase the use of ἤγειρεν in the Epistle separates it from the supposed parallel, in which the word is ἀνέστησεν. The passages in the Pauline Epistles corresponding with it are numerous (*e.g.*, 2 Cor. iv. 14, Ephes. i. 20). The second member of the sentence, which is of course the more important, is in reality, we contend, a reference to the very Psalm quoted in Acts immediately after the verse before us, couched in not unusual phraseology. Psalm xvi. 10 (Sept. xv.) reads : "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell" (ᾅδην).[1] In Ps. xviii. 5 (Sept. xvii. 5) we have, "The pains of hell (ὠδῖνες ᾅδου) compassed me about."[2] The difference between the ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου of the Epistle and the ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου of the Acts is so distinct that, finding a closer parallel in the Psalms to which reference is obviously made in both works, it is quite impossible to trace the phrase necessarily to the Acts. Such a passage cannot prove the use of that work, but, if it could, we might inquire what evidence for the authorship and trustworthiness of the Acts could be deduced from the circumstance?[3]

The second passage, referred to by a few writers, is as follows :—

Epistle viii.	Acts v. 41.
Let us therefore become imitators of his patience, and if we suffer for his name, let us praise him.	So they departed from the presence of the Council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name.
Μιμηταὶ οὖν γενώμεθα τῆς ὑπομονῆς αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐὰν πάσχωμεν διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, δοξάζωμεν αὐτόν.	Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ συνεδρίου, ὅτι κατηξιώθησαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀτιμασθῆναι.

It is not necessary to do more than contrast these passages to show how little the *Epistle of Polycarp* can witness for the Acts of the Apostles. We have already examined another supposed reference to this very passage, and the expressions in the Epistle, whilst scarcely presenting a single point of linguistic analogy to the sentence in the Acts, only tend to show how

[1] *Cod. E.* reads ᾅδου.

[2] In the Sept. version of Job xxxix. 2 the expression ὠδῖνας δὲ αὐτῶν ἔλυσας occurs.

[3] For the date and character of the Epistle see discussion, p. 175 f.

common and natural such language was in the early Church in connection with persecution. Whilst we constantly meet with the thought expressed by the writer of the Epistle throughout the writings of the New Testament, we may more particularly point to the first Petrine epistle for further instances of this tone of exhortation to those suffering persecution for the cause. For instance, 1 Pet. ii. 19 f., and again iii. 14,[1] "But if ye even suffer (πάσχοιτε) for righteousness' sake, blessed are ye." In the next chapter the tone is still more closely analogous. Speaking of persecutions, the writer says, iv. 13, "……but according as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings rejoice," etc. 14. "If ye are reproached in Christ's name (ἐν ὀνόματι X.), blessed are ye, for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you." 15. "For let none of you suffer (πασχέτω) as a murderer," etc. 16. "But if as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but *let him praise God* in this name (δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ)," etc Nothing but evidential destitution could rely upon the expression in the *Epistle of Polycarp* to show acquaintance with Acts.

Few Apologists point out with confidence any passages from the voluminous writings of Justin Martyr, as indicating the use of the Acts of the Apostles. We may, however, quote such expressions as are advanced. The first of these is the following: "For the Jews, having the prophecies and ever expecting the Christ to come, knew him not (ἠγνόησαν); and not only so, but they also maltreated him. But the Gentiles, who had never heard anything regarding the Christ until his Apostles, having gone forth from Jerusalem, declared the things concerning him, and delivered the prophecies, having been filled with joy and faith, renounced their idols and dedicated themselves to the unbegotten God through the Christ."[2] This is compared with Acts xiii. 27, "For they that dwell at Jerusalem and their rulers not knowing this (man) (τοῦτον ἀγνοήσαντες), nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every sabbath day, fulfilled them by their judgment of him," etc. 48. "But the Gentiles, hearing, rejoiced and glorified the word of the Lord," etc. We may at once proceed to give the next passage. In the *Dialogue with Trypho*, Justin has by quotations from the prophets endeavoured to show that the sufferings of Christ and also the glory of his second advent had been foretold, and Trypho replies: "Supposing these things to have been as thou sayest, and that it was foretold that Christ was to suffer (ὅτι παθητὸς Χριστὸς προεφητεύθη μελλειν εἶναι), and has been called a Stone, and after his first coming, in which it had been announced that he was to

[1] Ver. 13, according to some MSS., reads: "And who is he that will harm you, if ye become *imitators* (μιμηταὶ) of the good?"

[2] *Apol.*, i. 49.

suffer, should come in glory, and become judge of all, and eternal king and priest," etc.:[1] and in another place: "For if it had been obscurely declared by the prophets that the Christ should suffer (*παθητὸν γενησόμενον ὁ Χριστὸν*) and after these things be lord of all," etc.[2] This is compared with Acts xxvi. 22, "..... saying nothing except those things which the prophets and Moses said were to come to pass, (23) whether the Christ should suffer (*εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός*), whether, the first out of the resurrection from the dead, he is about to proclaim light unto the people and to the Gentiles." It is only necessary to quote these passages to show how unreasonable it is to maintain that they show the use of the Acts by Justin. He simply sets forth from the prophets, direct, the doctrines which formed the great text of the early Church. Some of the warmest supporters of the Canon admit the "uncertainty" of such coincidences, and do not think it worth while to advance them. There are one or two still more distant analogies sometimes pointed out which do not require more particular notice.[3] There is no evidence whatever that Justin was acquainted with the Acts of the Apostles.[4]

Some writers claim Hegesippus as evidence for the existence of the Acts, on the strength of the following passages in the fragment of his book preserved by Eusebius. He puts into the mouth of James the Just, whilst being martyred, the expression: "I beseech (thee) Lord God, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." This is compared with the words said to have been uttered by the martyr Stephen, Acts vii. 60, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." The passage is more commonly advanced as showing acquaintance with Luke xxiii. 34, and we have already discussed it.[5] Lardner apparently desires it to do double duty, but it is scarcely worth while seriously to refer to the claim here. The passage more generally relied upon, though that also is only advanced by a few,[6] is the following, "This man was a faithful

[1] *Dial.* 36. [2] *Dial.* 76.

[3] *Apol.*, i. 50, cf. Acts i. 8 f.; *Apol.*, i. 40, cf. Acts iv. 27; *Apol.*, ii. 10, cf. Acts xvii. 23; *Dial.* 8, cf. Acts xxvi. 29; *Dial.* 20, cf. Acts x. 14; *Dial.* 68, cf. Acts ii. 30.

[4] Credner, *Einl. N. T.*, i. 1, p. 274; Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doct.*, ii., p. 329; Eichhorn, *Einl. N. T.*, ii., p. 75; Meyer, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 1 f.; Zeller, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 49 f. Dean Alford says: "Nor are there any references in Justin Martyr, which, fairly considered, belong to this book" (*Greek Test.*, 1871, *Prolegg.*, ii., p. 20). Dr. Westcott says: "The references to the Acts are uncertain"; and he merely illustrates this by referring to the first of the passages discussed in the text (*On the Canon*, 1875, p. 168, note 3). [5] P. 273 f.

[6] Lardner, *Credibility*, *Works*, ii. 142; Westcott, *On the Canon*, 4th ed., p. 205. Dr. Westcott, however, merely says: "There are forms of expression corresponding to passages in.....and in the Acts which can scarcely be attributed to chance."

witness both to Jews and Greeks that Jesus is the Christ"[1] (Μάρτυς οὗτος ἀληθὴς Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησι γεγένηται, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν). This is compared with Acts xx. 21, where Paul is represented as saying of himself, ".....testifying fully both to Jews and Greeks repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ" (Διαμαρτυρόμενος Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησιν τὴν εἰς θεὸν μετάνοιαν, καὶ πίστιν εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν' I. X.). The two passages are totally different both in sense and language, and that the use of Acts is deduced from so distant an analogy only serves to show the slightness of the evidence with which Apologists have to be content.

Papias need not long detain us, for it is freely admitted by most divines that he does not afford evidence of any value that he was acquainted with the Acts. For the sake of completeness we may, however, refer to the points which are sometimes mentioned. A fragment of the work of Papias is preserved giving an account of the death of Judas, which differs materially both from the account in the first Synoptic and in Acts i. 18 f.[2] Judas is represented as having gone about the world a great example of impiety, for, his body having swollen so much that he could not pass where a waggon easily passed, he was crushed by the waggon so that his entrails emptied out (ὥστε τὰ ἔγκατα αὐτοῦ ἐκκενωθῆναι). Apollinaris of Laodicæa quotes this passage to show that Judas did not die when he hung himself, but subsequently met with another fate, in this way reconciling the statements in the Gospel and Acts.[3] He does not say that Papias used the story for this purpose, and it is fundamentally contradictory to the account in Acts i. 18, 19: "Now this man purchased a field with the reward of the unrighteousness, and falling headlong burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out" (καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ). It is scarcely necessary to argue that the passage does not indicate any acquaintance with Acts,[4] as some few critics are inclined to assert.[5]

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii. 23. [2] P. 296 f. [3] Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.*, i., p. 25 f. [4] Overbeck, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 39 f. Cf. Steitz, *Th. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1868, p. 87 f.; Meyer, *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 2, anm.* * Dr. Westcott says: "In his account of the fate of Judas Iscariot there is a remarkable divergence from the narrative in Matt. xxvii. 5 and Acts i. 18" (*On the Canon*, 4th ed., p. 77, n. 1).

[5] Zahn, *Th. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1866, p. 680 f. Dr. Lightfoot says: "But there are indications, however indecisive, that Papias did use the writings of St. Luke." And further on, after quoting the passage about Judas, and mentioning the view of Apollinaris that it reconciles the accounts in the first Gospel and in the Acts, he continues: "It is too much to assume that Papias himself repeated the tradition with this aim, but the resemblance to the account in the Acts is worthy of notice" (*Contemporary Rev.*, August, 1876, p. 415).

The next analogy pointed out is derived from the statement of Eusebius that Papias mentions a wonderful story which he had heard from the daughters of Philip (whom Eusebius calls "the Apostle") regarding a dead man raised to life.[1] In Acts xxi. 8, 9, it is stated that Philip the evangelist had four daughters. It is hardly conceivable that this should be advanced as an indication that Papias knew the Acts. The last point is that Eusebius says: "And again (he narrates) another marvel regarding Justus who was surnamed Barsabas; how he drank a baneful poison and by the grace of the Lord sustained no harm. But that this Justus, after the Ascension of the Saviour, the holy apostles appointed with Matthias, and that they prayed (on the occasion) of the filling up of their number by lot instead of the traitor Judas, the scripture of the Acts thus relates: 'And they appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias. And they prayed and said,' etc."[2] Whatever argument can be deduced from this obviously rests entirely upon the fact that Papias is said to have referred to Justus who was named Barsabas, for of course the last sentence is added by Eusebius himself, and has nothing to do with Papias. This is fairly admitted by Lardner and others. Lardner says: "Papias does undoubtedly give some confirmation to the history of the Acts of the Apostles, in what he says of Philip; and especially in what he says of Justus, called Barsabas. But I think it cannot be affirmed that he did particularly mention, or refer to, the book of the Acts. For I reckon it is Eusebius himself who adds that quotation out of the Acts, upon occasion of what Papias had written of the before-mentioned Barsabas."[3] There is no evidence worthy of attention that Papias was acquainted with the Acts.

No one seriously pretends that the *Clementine Homilies* afford any evidence of the use or existence of the Acts; and few, if any, claim the *Epistle to Diognetus* as testimony for it.[4] We may, however, quote the only passage which is pointed out: ".....these who hold the view that they present them (offerings) to God as

[1] *H. E.*, iii. 39.

[2] *H. E.*, iii. 39.

[3] *Credibility*, etc., *Works*, ii., p. 133. Kirchhofer makes a similar statement, *Quellenw.*, p. 163, anm. 1. Dr. Lightfoot says: "Other points of affinity to the Acts are his mention of Justus Barsabas, and his relations with the daughters of Philip" (*Contemp. Rev.*, August, 1876, p. 415). Such "indications" he may indeed well characterise as "indecisive." Dr. Westcott says: "Dr. Lightfoot notices some slight indications of Papias' use of the writings of St. Luke (in the article quoted above), but I do not think that much stress can be laid on them" (*On the Canon*, 4th ed., p. 77, note 1).

[4] Dr. Westcott merely speaks of "coincidences of language more or less evident with the Acts," etc., referring to c. iii. (Acts xvii. 24, 25) as "worthy of remark" (*Canon*, p. 91); but he does not include it in the *Synopsis of Historical Evidence*, p. 584.

needing them might more rightly esteem it foolishness and not worship of God. For he who made the heaven and the earth, and all things in them, and who supplies to us all whatever we need, can himself be in need of none of those things which he himself presents to those who imagine that they give (to him)."[1] This is compared with Acts xvii. 24: "The God that made the world and all things in it, he being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; (25) neither is served by men's hand as though he needed anything, seeing he himself giveth to all life and breath and all things." There is nothing here but a coincidence of sense, though with much variation between the two passages; but the Epistle argues from a different context, and this illustration is obvious enough to be common to any moralist. There is not a single reason which points to the Acts as the source of the writer's argument.

Basilides and Valentinus are not claimed at all by Apologists as witnesses for the existence of the Acts of the Apostles, nor is Marcion, whose canon, however, of which it formed no part, is rather adverse to the work than merely negative. Tertullian taunts Marcion for receiving Paul as an apostle, although his name is not mentioned in the Gospel, and yet not receiving the Acts of the Apostles in which alone his history is narrated;[2] but it does not in the least degree follow from this that Marcion knew the work and deliberately rejected it.

A passage of Tatian's *Oration to the Greeks* is pointed out by some[3] as showing his acquaintance with the Acts. It is as follows: "I am not willing to worship the creation made by him for us. Sun and moon are made for us; how, therefore, shall I worship my own servants? How can I declare stocks and stones to be gods?.....But neither should the unnameable (ἀνωνόμαστον) God be presented with bribes; for he who is without need of anything (πάντων ἀνενδεής) must not be calumniated by us as needy (ἐνδεής)."[4] This is compared with Acts xvii. 24, 25, quoted above, and it only serves to show how common such language was. Lardner himself says of the passage: "This is much the same thought, and applied to the same purpose, with Paul's, Acts xvii. 25, *as though he needeth anything*. But it is a character of the Deity so obvious that I think it cannot determine us to suppose he had an eye to those words of the Apostle."[5] The language, indeed, is quite different, and shows no acquaintance with the Acts. Eusebius states that the Severians who more fully

[1] *Ep. ad Diognetum*, c. iii. [2] *Adv. Marc.*, v. 1 f.

[3] Kirchhofer, (*Quellens.*, p. 166; Lardner mentions, merely to disclaim, it. *Credibility*, etc., *Works*, ii., p. 139 f. Dr. Westcott does not advance it at all.

[4] *Orat. ad Graecos*, c. iv. [5] *Credibility*, etc., *Works*, ii., p. 139 f.

established Tatian's heresy rejected both the Epistles of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles.[1]

Dionysius of Corinth is rarely adduced by anyone as testimony for the Acts. The only ground upon which he is at all referred to is a statement of Eusebius in mentioning his Epistles. Speaking of his Epistle to the Athenians, Eusebius says: "He relates, moreover, that Dionysius the Areopagite who was converted to the faith by Paul the Apostle, according to the account given in the Acts, was appointed the first bishop of the Church of the Athenians."[2] Even Apologists admit that it is doubtful how far Dionysius referred to the Acts,[3] the mention of the book here being most obviously made by Eusebius himself.

Melito of Sardis is not appealed to by any writer in connection with our work, nor can Claudius Apollinaris be pressed into this service. Athenagoras is supposed by some to refer to the very same passage in Acts xvii. 24, 25, which we have discussed when dealing with the work of Tatian. Athenagoras says: "The Creator and Father of the universe is not in need of blood, nor of the steam of burnt sacrifices, nor of the fragrance of flowers and of incense, he himself being the perfect fragrance, inwardly and outwardly without need."[4] And further on: "And you kings indeed build palaces for yourselves; but the world is not made as being needed by God."[5] These passages occur in the course of a defence of Christians for not offering sacrifices, and both in language and context they are quite independent of the Acts of the Apostles.

In the *Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons*, giving an account of the persecution against them, it is said that the victims were praying for those from whom they suffered cruelties: "like Stephen the perfect martyr: 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.' But if he was supplicating for those who stoned him, how much more for the brethren?"[6] The prayer here quoted agrees with that ascribed to Stephen in Acts vii. 60. There is no mention of the Acts of the Apostles in the Epistle, and the source from which the writers obtained their information about Stephen is of course not stated. If there really was a martyr of the name of Stephen, and if these words were actually spoken by him, the tradition of the fact, and the memory of his noble saying, may well have remained in the Church, or have been recorded in writings then current; from one of which, indeed, eminent critics

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 29.

[2] *Ib.*, iv. 23.

[3] Lardner, *Credibility*, etc., *Works*, ii., p. 134; Kirchhofer, *Quellens.*, p. 163. Dr. Westcott naturally does not refer to the passage at all.

[4] *Leg. pro Christ.*, xiii.

[5] *Ib.*, xvi.

[6] Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 2.

conjecture that the author of Acts derived his materials,[1] and in this case the passage obviously does not prove the use of the Acts. If, on the other hand, there never was such a martyr by whom these words were spoken, and the whole story must be considered an original invention by the author of Acts, then in that case, and in that case only, the passage does show the use of the Acts.[2] Supposing that the use of Acts be held to be thus indicated, what does this prove? Merely that the Acts of the Apostles were in existence in the year 177 178, when the *Epistle of Vienne and Lyons* was written. No light whatever would thus be thrown upon the question of its authorship; and neither its credibility nor its sufficiency to prove the reality of a cycle of miracles would be in the slightest degree established.

Ptolemæus and Heracleon need not detain us, as it is not alleged that they show acquaintance with the Acts, nor is Celsus claimed as testimony for the book.

The *Canon of Muratori* contains a very corrupt paragraph regarding the Acts of the Apostles. We have already discussed the date and character of this fragment,[3] and need not further speak of it here. The sentence in which we are now interested reads in the original as follows :—

"*Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scribta sunt lucas obtime theofile conprindit quia sub præsentia eius singula gerebantur sicute et semote passionem petri euidenter declarat sed et profectionem pauli ab urbes ad spania proficescentis.*"

It is probable that in addition to its corruption some words may have been lost from the concluding phrase of this passage, but the following may perhaps sufficiently represent its general sense: "But the Acts of all the Apostles were written in one book. Luke included (in his work) to the excellent Theophilus only the things which occurred in his own presence, as he evidently shows by omitting the martyrdom of Peter and also the setting forth of Paul from the city to Spain."

Whilst this passage may prove the existence of the Acts about the end of the second century, and that the authorship of the work

[1] Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 341 f., p. 347 f.; Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vi., 1858, p. 37, p. 191 f.; Gfrörer, *Die heil. Sage*, 1838, i., p. 404, p. 409 f.; Meyer, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 12; Neander, *Pflanzung. u. s. w. chr. Kirche*, 5te *Aufl.*, p. 65, anm. 2; Schwanbeck, *Quellen d. Schr. des Lukas*, 1847, i., p. 250 f.; De Wette, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 249 f., etc.

[2] Dr. Lightfoot, speaking of the passage we are discussing, says: "Will he (author of *S. R.*) boldly maintain that the writers had before them another Acts containing words identical with our Acts, just as he supposes, etc.....Or will he allow this account to have been taken from Acts vii. 60, with which it coincides?" (*Contemp. Review*, August, 1876, p. 410). The question is here answered.

[3] P. 427 f.

was ascribed to Luke, it has no further value. No weight can be attached to the statement of the unknown writer beyond that of merely testifying to the currency of such a tradition, and even the few words quoted show how uncritical he was. Nothing could be less appropriate to the work before us than the assertion that it contains the Acts of *all* the Apostles; for it must be apparent to all, and we shall hereafter have to refer to the point, that it very singularly omits all record of the acts of most of the Apostles, occupies itself chiefly with those of Peter and Paul, and devotes considerable attention to Stephen and to others who were not Apostles at all. We shall further have occasion to show that the writer does anything but confine himself to the events of which he was an eye-witness, and we may merely remark in passing, as a matter which scarcely concerns us here, that the instances given by the unknown writer of the fragment to support his assertion are not only irrelevant, but singularly devoid themselves of historical attestation.

Irenæus[1] assigns the Acts of the Apostles to Luke, as do Clement of Alexandria,[2] Tertullian,[3] and Origen,[4] although without any statements giving special weight to their mention of him as the author in any way counterbalancing the late date of their testimony. Beyond showing that tradition, at the end of the second century and beginning of the third, associated the name of Luke with this writing and the third Gospel, the evidence of these Fathers is of no value to us. We have already incidentally mentioned that some heretics either ignored or rejected the book, and to the Marcionites and Severians we may now add the Ebionites[5] and Manichæans.[6] Chrysostom complains that in his day the Acts of the Apostles were so neglected that many were ignorant of the existence of the book and of its authors.[7] Doubts as to its authorship were expressed in the ninth century, for Photius states that some ascribed the work to Clement of Rome, others to Barnabas, and others to Luke the Evangelist.[8]

If we turn to the document itself, we find that it professes to be the second portion of a work written for the information of an unknown person named Theophilus, the first part being the Gospel, which, in our canonical New Testament, bears the name of "Gospel according to Luke." The narrative is a continuation

[1] *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 14, §§ 1, 2; 15, § 1, etc.
[2] *Strom.*, v. 12; *Adumbr. in 1 Petr. Ep.*
[3] *De Jejunio*, x.
[4] *Contra Cels.*, vi. 12.
[5] Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxx. 16.
[6] August., *Epist.* 237; *ed. Bened.*, ii., p. 644; *De Util. Cred.*, ii. 7, T. viii., p. 36; cf. Beausobre, *Hist. de Manichée*, i., p. 293 f..
[7] *Hom. i. in Act. Apost.*
[8] Τὸν δὲ συγγραφέα τῶν πράξεων οἱ μὲν Κλήμεντα λέγουσι τὸν Ῥώμης, ἄλλοι δὲ Βαρνάβαν, καὶ ἄλλοι Λουκᾶν τὸν εὐαγγελιστήν. Photius, *Amphiloch. Quæst.*, 145.

of the third Synoptic, but the actual title of "Acts of the Apostles," or "Acts of Apostles" (*πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων, πράξεις ἀποστόλων*),[1] attached to this *δεύτερος λόγος* is a later addition, and formed no part of the original document. The author's name is not given in any of the earlier MSS., and the work is entirely anonymous. That in the prologue to the Acts the writer clearly assumes to be the author of the Gospel does not in any way identify him, inasmuch as the third Synoptic itself is anonymous. The tradition assigning both works to Luke, the follower of Paul, as we have seen, is first met with towards the end of the second century, and very little weight can be attached to it. There are too many instances of early writings, several of which indeed have secured a place in our canon, to which distinguished names have been erroneously ascribed. Such tradition is notoriously liable to error.

We shall presently return to the question of the authorship of the third Synoptic and Acts of the Apostles, but at present we may so far anticipate as to say that there are good reasons for affirming that they could not have been written by Luke, the follower of Paul.

Confining ourselves here to the actual evidence before us, we arrive at a clear and unavoidable conclusion regarding the Acts of the Apostles. After examining all the early Christian literature, and taking every passage which is referred to as indicating the use of the book, we see that there is no certain trace even of its existence till towards the end of the second century; and, whilst the writing itself is anonymous, we find no authority but late tradition assigning it to Luke or to any other author. We are without evidence of any value as to its accuracy or trustworthiness, and, as we shall presently see, the epistles of Paul, so far from accrediting it, tend to cast the most serious doubt upon its whole character. This evidence we have yet to examine, when considering the contents of the Acts, and we base our present remarks solely on the external testimony for the date and authorship of the book. The position, therefore, is simply this: We are asked to believe in the reality of a great number of miraculous and supernatural occurrences which, obviously, are antecedently incredible, upon the assurance of an anonymous work of whose existence there is no distinct evidence till more than a century after the events narrated, and to which an author's name against which there are strong objections—is first ascribed by tradition towards the end of the second century. Of the writer to whom the work is thus attributed we know nothing beyond the casual mention of

[1] The *Cod. Sin.* reads simply *πράξεις*. *Cod. D.* (*Bezæ*) has *πράξις ἀποστόλων* (*Acting of Apostles*).

his name in some Pauline Epistles. If it were admitted that this Luke did actually write the book, we should not be justified in believing the reality of such stupendous miracles upon his bare statement. As the case stands, however, even taken in its most favourable aspect, the question scarcely demands serious attention, and our discussion might at once be ended by the unhesitating rejection of the Acts of the Apostles as sufficient, or even plausible, evidence for the miracles which it narrates.

CHAPTER II.

EVIDENCE REGARDING THE AUTHORSHIP

If we proceed further to discuss the document before us, it is from no doubt as to the certainty of the conclusion at which we have now arrived, but from the belief that closer examination of the contents of the Acts may enable us to test this result, and more fully understand the nature of the work and the character of its evidence. Not only will it be instructive to consider a little closely the contents of the Acts, and to endeavour from the details of the narrative itself to form a judgment regarding its historical value, but we have, in addition, external testimony of very material importance which we may bring to bear upon it. We happily possess some undoubted Epistles which afford us no little information concerning the history, character, and teaching of the Apostle Paul, and we are thus enabled to compare the statements in the work before us with contemporary evidence of great value. It is unnecessary to say that, wherever the statements of the unknown author of the Acts are at variance with these Epistles, we must prefer the statements of the Apostle. The importance to our inquiry of such further examination as we now propose to undertake consists chiefly in the light which it may throw on the credibility of the work. If it be found that such portions as we are able to investigate are inaccurate and untrustworthy, it will become still more apparent that the evidence of such a document for miracles cannot even be entertained. It may be well also to discuss more fully the authorship of the Acts, and to this we shall first address ourselves.

It must, however, be borne in mind that it is quite foreign to our purpose to enter into any exhaustive discussion of the literary problem presented by the Acts of the Apostles. We shall confine ourselves to such points as seem sufficient, or best fitted, to test the character of the composition; and we shall not hesitate to pass without attention questions of mere literary interest, and strictly limit our examination to these more prominent features.

It is generally admitted, although not altogether without exception, that the author of our third synoptic Gospel likewise composed the Acts of the Apostles. The linguistic and other peculiarities which distinguish the Gospel are equally prominent in the Acts. This fact, whilst apparently offering greatly increased

facilities for identifying the author, and actually affording valuable material for estimating his work, does not, as we have already remarked, really do much towards solving the problem of the authorship, inasmuch as the Gospel, like its continuation, is anonymous, and we possess no more precise or direct evidence in connection with the one than in the case of the other. We have already so fully examined the testimony for the third Gospel that it is unnecessary for us to recur to it. From about the end of the second century we find the Gospel and Acts of the Apostles ascribed by ecclesiastical writers to Luke, the companion of the Apostle Paul. The fallibility of tradition, and the singular phase of literary morality exhibited during the early ages of Christianity, render such testimony of little or no value, and in the almost total absence of the critical faculty a rank crop of pseudonymic writings sprang up and flourished during that period. Some of the earlier chapters of this work have given abundant illustrations of this fact. It is certain, with regard to the works we are considering, that Irenæus is the earliest writer known who ascribes them to Luke, and that even tradition, therefore, cannot be traced beyond the last quarter of the second century. The question is: Does internal evidence confirm or contradict this tradition?

Luke, the traditional author, is not mentioned by name in the Acts of the Apostles. In the Epistle to Philemon his name occurs, with those of others, who send greeting, verse 23: "There salute thee, Epaphras, my fellow-prisoner in Christ Jesus: 24. Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, my fellow-labourers." In the Epistle to the Colossians, iv. 14, mention is also made of him: "Luke, the beloved physician, salutes you, and Demas." And, again, in the 2 Epistle to Timothy, iv. 10: "For Demas forsook me, having loved this present world, and departed into Thessalonica, Crescens to Galatia, Titus unto Dalmatia: 11. Only Luke is with me."

He is not mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament;[1] and his name is not again met with till Irenæus ascribes to him the authorship of the Gospel and Acts. There is nothing in these Pauline Epistles confirming the statement of the Fathers, but it is highly probable that these references to him largely contributed to suggest his name as the author of the Acts, its very omission from the work itself protecting him from objections connected with the passages in the first person to which other followers of Paul were exposed. Irenæus evidently knew nothing about him, except what he learnt from these Epistles, and derives from his theory

[1] It is now universally admitted that the "Lucius" referred to in Acts xiii. 1 and Rom. xvi. 21 is a different person; although their identity was suggested by Origen and the Alexandrian Clement.

that Luke wrote the Acts, and speaks as an eye-witness in the passages where the first person is used. From these he argues that Luke was inseparable from Paul, and was his fellow-worker in the Gospel; and he refers, in proof of this, to Acts xvi. 8 f.,[1] 13 f., xx. 5 f., and the later chapters, all the details of which he supposes Luke to have carefully written down. He then continues: "But that he was not only a follower, but likewise a fellow-worker of the Apostles, but particularly of Paul, Paul himself has also clearly shown in the Epistles, saying....."; and he quotes 2 Tim. iv. 10, 11, ending, "Only Luke is with me," and then adds, "whence he shows that he was always with him and inseparable from him," etc.[2] The reasoning of the zealous Father deduces a great deal from very little, it will be observed, and in this elastic way tradition "enlarged its borders" and assumed unsubstantial dimensions. Later writers have no more intimate knowledge of Luke, although Eusebius states that he was born at Antioch,[3] a tradition likewise reproduced by Jerome.[4] Jerome further identifies Luke with "the brother, whose praise in the Gospel is throughout all the churches," mentioned in 2 Cor. viii. 18, as accompanying Titus to Corinth.[5] At a later period, when the Church required an early artist for its service, Luke the physician was honoured with the additional title of painter.[6] Epiphanius,[7] followed later by some other writers, represented him to have been one of the seventy-

[1] The words "they came down to Troas" (*κατέβησαν εἰς Τρωάδα*) are here translated "we came to Troas" (*nos venimus in Troadem*).

[2] "*Quoniam non solum prosecutor, sed et cooperarius fuerit apostolorum, maxime autem Pauli, et ipse autem Paulus manifestavit in epistolis, dicens: 'Demas me dereliquit, et abiit Thessalonicam, Crescens in Galatiam, Titus in Dalmatiam. Lucas est mecum solus.' Unde ostendit, quod semper junctus ei et inseparabilis fuerit ab eo*" (*Adv. Hær.*, iii. 14, § 1).

[3] *H. E.*, iii. 4. [4] *De vir. ill.*, 7.

[5] This view was held by Origen, Ambrose, and others of the Fathers, who, moreover, suppose Paul to refer to the work of Luke when he speaks of "his Gospel" (also cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 4), an opinion exploded by Grotius. Grotius and Olshausen both identify "the brother" with Luke. Many of the Fathers and later writers have variously conjectured him to have been Barnabas, Silas, Mark, Trophimus, Gaius, and others. This is mere guess-work; but Luke is scarcely seriously advanced in later times. Dr. Wordsworth, however, not only does so, but maintains that Paul quotes Luke's Gospel in his Epistles, in one place (1 Tim. v. 18) designating it as *Scripture* (*Greek Test., Four Gospels*, p. 163, p. 170).

[6] Nicephorus, *H. E.*, ii. 43. Dr. Wordsworth, who speaks of "this divine book," the Acts of the Apostles, with great enthusiasm, says in one place: "The Acts of the Apostles is a portraiture of the Church; it is an Historical Picture delineated by the Holy Ghost guiding the hand of the Evangelical Painter St. Luke" (*Greek Test., Int. to Acts*, 1874, p. 4).

[7] *Hær.* li. 11; Theophylact (*ad Luc.* xxiv. 18) suggests the view considered probable by Lange (*Leben Jesu*, i., p. 252) that Luke was one of the two disciples of the journey to Emmaus. This is the way in which tradition works.

two disciples, whose mission he alone of all New Testament writers mentions. The view of the Fathers, arising out of the application of their tradition to the features presented by the Gospel and Acts, was that Luke composed his Gospel, of the events of which he was not an eye-witness, from information derived from others, and his Acts of the Apostles from what he himself, at least in the parts in which the first person is employed, had witnessed.[1] It is generally supposed that Luke was not born a Jew, but was a Gentile Christian.

Some writers endeavour to find a confirmation of the tradition, that the Gospel and Acts were written by Luke "the beloved physician," by the supposed use of peculiarly technical medical terms; but very little weight is attached by any one to this feeble evidence, which is repudiated by most serious critics, and it need not detain us.

As there is no indication, either in the Gospel or the Acts, of the author's identity proceeding from himself—and tradition does not offer any alternative security—what testimony can be produced in support of the ascription of these writings to "Luke"? To this question Ewald shall reply. "In fact," he says, "we possess only one ground for it, but this is fully sufficient. It lies in the designation of the third Gospel as that 'according to Luke' which is found in all MSS. of the four Gospels. For the quotations of this particular Gospel under the distinct name of Luke in the extant writings of the Fathers begin so late that they cannot be compared in antiquity with that superscription; and those known to us may probably themselves only go back to this superscription. We thus depend almost alone on this superscription."[2] Ewald generally does consider his own arbitrary conjectures "fully sufficient," but it is doubtful whether in this case any one who examines this evidence will agree with him. He himself goes on to admit, with all other critics, that the superscriptions to our Gospels do not proceed from the authors themselves, but were added by those who collected them, or by later readers to distinguish them. There was no author's name attached to Marcion's Gospel, as we learn from Tertullian.[3] Chrysostom very distinctly asserts that the Evangelists did not inscribe their names at the head of their works,[4] and he recognises that, but for the authority of the primitive Church which added those names, the superscriptions could not have proved the authorship of the Gospels. He conjectures that the sole superscription which may have been placed

[1] Cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 4; Hieron., *de vir. ill.* 7. We need not discuss the views which attributes to Luke the translation or authorship of the Ep. to the Hebrews.

[2] Ewald, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, 1857, 1858, ix., p. 55.

[3] *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 2.

[4] *Hom. i. in. Epist. ad. Rom.*

by the author of the first Synoptic was simply εὐαγγέλιον.[1] It might be argued, and indeed has been, that the inscription κατὰ Λουκᾶν, "according to Luke," instead of εὐαγγέλιον Λουκᾶ, "Gospel of Luke," does not actually indicate that "Luke" wrote the work, any more than the superscription to the Gospels, "according to the Hebrews" (καθ' Ἑβραίους), "according to the Egyptians" (κατ' Αἰγυπτίους), has reference to authorship. The Epistles, on the contrary, are directly connected with their writers, in the genitive, Παύλου, Πέτρου, and so on. This point, however, we merely mention *en passant*. By his own admission, therefore, the superscription is simply tradition in another form; but, instead of carrying us further back, the superscription on the most ancient extant MSS., as for instance the Sinaitic and Vatican Codices of the Gospels, does not on the most sanguine estimate of their age date earlier than the fourth century. As for the Acts of the Apostles, the book is not ascribed to Luke in a single uncial MS., and it only begins to appear in various forms in later codices. The variation in the titles of the Gospels and Acts in different MSS. alone shows the uncertainty of the superscription. It is clear that the "one ground" upon which Ewald admits that the evidence for Luke's authorship is based is nothing but sand, and cannot support his tower. He is on the slightest consideration thrown back upon the quotations of the Fathers, which begin too late for the purpose; and it must be acknowledged that the ascription of the third Gospel and Acts to Luke rests solely upon late and unsupported tradition.

Let it be remembered that, with the exception of the three passages in the Pauline Epistles quoted above, we know absolutely nothing about Luke. As we have mentioned, it has even been doubted whether the designation, "the beloved physician," in the Epistle to the Colossians, iv. 14, does not distinguish a different Luke from the person of that name in the Epistles to Philemon and Timothy. If this were the case, our information would be further reduced; but supposing that the same Luke is referred to, what does our information amount to? Nothing but the fact that a person named Luke was represented by the writer of these letters,[2] whoever he was, to have been with Paul in Rome, and that he was known to the Church of Colossæ. There is no evidence that this Luke had been a travelling companion of

[1] *Hom.* i. in Matt. Grotius considers that the ancient heading was εὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, as in some MSS. of our second Synoptic (Annot. in *N. T.*, i., p. 7). So also Bertholdt, *Einl.*, iii., p. 1095, and others.

[2] We cannot discuss the authenticity of these Epistles in this place, nor is it very important that we should do so. Neither can we pause to consider whether they were written in Rome, as a majority of critics think, or elsewhere.

Paul, or that he ever wrote a line concerning him or had composed a Gospel. He is not mentioned in Epistles written during this journey, and the rarity and meagreness of the references to him would much rather indicate that he had not taken any distinguished part in the proclamation of the Gospel. If Luke be ὁ ἰατρὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, and be numbered amongst the Apostle's συνεργοί, Tychicus is equally "the beloved brother and faithful minister and fellow-servant in the Lord."[1] Onesimus the "faithful and beloved brother,"[2] and Aristarchus, Mark the cousin of Barnabas, Justus and others, are likewise his συνεργοί.[3] There is no evidence, in fact, that Paul was acquainted with Luke earlier than during his imprisonment in Rome, and he seems markedly excluded from the Apostle's work and company by such passages as 2 Cor. i. 19. The simple theory that Luke wrote the Acts supplies all the rest of the tradition of the Fathers, as we have seen in the case of Irenæus, and to this mere tradition we are confined in the total absence of more ancient testimony.

The traditional view, which long continued to prevail undisturbed, and has been widely held up to our own day, represents Luke as the author of the Acts, and, in the passages where the first person is employed, considers that he indicates himself as an actor and eye-witness. These passages, where ἡμεῖς is introduced, present a curious problem which has largely occupied the attention of critics, and it has been the point most firmly disputed in the long controversy regarding the authorship of the Acts. Into this literary labyrinth we must not be tempted to enter beyond a very short way; for, however interesting the question may be in itself, we are left so completely to conjecture that no result is possible which can materially affect our inquiry, and we shall only refer to it sufficiently to illustrate the uncertainty which prevails regarding the authorship. We shall, however, supply abundant references for those who care more minutely to pursue the subject.

After the narrative of the Acts has, through fifteen chapters, proceeded uninterruptedly in the third person, an abrupt change to the first person plural occurs in the sixteenth chapter.[4] Paul, and at least Timothy, are represented as going through Phrygia and Galatia, and at length "they came down to Troas," where a vision appears to Paul beseeching him to come over into Macedonia. Then, xvi. 10, proceeds: "And after he saw the vision, immediately we endeavoured (ἐζητήσαμεν) to go forth into Macedonia, concluding that God had called us (ἡμᾶς) to preach

[1] ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος καὶ σύνδουλος ἐν Κυρίῳ. Coloss. iv. 7.

[2] Coloss. iv. 9. [3] *Ib.*, iv. 10, 11; Philem. 23, 24.

[4] It is unnecessary to discuss whether xiv. 22 belongs to the ἡμεῖς sections or not.

the Gospel unto them." After verse 17 the direct form of narrative is as suddenly dropped as it was taken up, and does not reappear until xx. 5, when, without explanation, it is resumed and continued for ten verses. It is then again abandoned, and recommenced in xxi. 1–18, and xxvii. 1, xxviii. 16.

It is argued by those who adopt the traditional view that it would be an instance of unparalleled negligence, in so careful a writer as the author of the third Synoptic and Acts, to have composed these sections from documents lying before him, written by others, leaving them in the form of a narrative in the first person, whilst the rest of his work was written in the third, and that, without doubt, he would have assimilated such portions to the form of the rest. On the other hand, he himself makes distinct use of the first person in Luke i. 1–3 and Acts i. 1, and consequently prepares the reader to expect that, where it is desirable, he will resume the direct mode of communication; and in support of this supposition it is asserted that the very same peculiarities of style and language exist in the ἡμεῖς passages as in the rest of the work. The adoption of the direct form of narrative, in short, merely indicates that the author himself was present and an eye-witness of what he relates, and that writing as he did for the information of Theophilus, who was well aware of his personal participation in the journeys he records, it was not necessary for him to give any explanation of his occasional use of the first person.

Is the abrupt and singular introduction of the first person in these particular sections of his work, without a word of explanation, more intelligible and reasonable upon the traditional theory of their being by the author himself as an eye-witness? On the contrary, it is maintained, the phenomenon on that hypothesis becomes much more inexplicable. On examining the ἡμεῖς sections it will be observed that they consist almost entirely of an itinerary of journeys, and that, while the chronology of the rest of the Acts is notably uncertain and indefinite, these passages enter into the minutest details of daily movements (xvi. 11, 12; xx. 6, 7, 11, 15; xxi. 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 18; xxvii. 2; xxviii. 7, 12, 14); of the route pursued, and places through which often they merely pass (xvi. 11, 12; xx. 5, 6, 13, 15; xxi. 1–3, 7; xxvii. 2 f.; xxviii. 11–15), and record the most trifling circumstances (xvi. 12; xx. 13; xxi. 2, 3, 15; xxviii. 2, 11). The distinguishing feature of these sections, in fact, is generally asserted to be the stamp which they bear, above all other parts of the Acts, of intimate personal knowledge of the circumstances related.

Is it not, however, exceedingly remarkable that the author of the Acts should intrude his own personality merely to record these minute details of voyages and journeys—that his appearance as

an eye-witness should be almost wholly limited to the itinerary of Paul's journeys and to portions of his history which are of very subordinate interest? The voyage and shipwreck are thus narrated with singular minuteness of detail, but if we consider the matter for a moment, it will become apparent that this elaboration of the narrative is altogether disproportionate to the importance of the voyage in the history of the early Church. The traditional view, indeed, is fatal to the claims of the Acts as testimony for the great mass of miracles it contains, for the author is only an eye-witness of what is comparatively unimportant and commonplace. The writer's intimate acquaintance with the history of Paul, and his claim to participation in his work, begin and end with his actual journeys. With very few exceptions, as soon as the Apostle stops anywhere, he ceases to speak as an eye-witness, and relapses into vagueness and the third person. At the very time when minuteness of detail would have been most interesting, he ceases to be minute. A very long and important period of Paul's life is covered by the narrative between xvi. 10, where the ἡμεῖς sections begin, and xxviii. 16, where they end; but, although the author goes with such extraordinary detail into the journeys to which they are confined, how bare and unsatisfactory is the account of the rest of Paul's career during that time! How eventful that career must have been we learn from 2 Cor. xi. 23–26. In any case, the author who could be so minute in his record of an itinerary, apparently could not, or would not, be minute in his account of more important matters in his history. In the few verses, ix. 1–30, chiefly occupied by an account of Paul's conversion, is comprised all that the author has to tell of three years of the Apostle's life, and into xi. 19–xiv. are compressed the events of fourteen years of his history (cf. Gal. ii. 1). If the author of those portions be the same writer who is so minute in his daily itinerary in the ἡμεῖς sections, his sins of omission and commission are of a very startling character. To say nothing more severe here, upon the traditional theory he is an elaborate trifler.

Does the use of the first person in Luke i. 1–3 and Acts. i. 1 in any way justify or prepare the way for the sudden and unexplained introduction of the first person in the sixteenth chapter? Certainly not. The ἐγώ in these passages is used solely in the personal address to Theophilus, is limited to the brief explanation contained in what may be called the dedication or preface, and is at once dropped when the history begins. If the prologue of the Gospel be applied to the Acts, moreover, the use of earlier documents is at once implied, which would rather justify the supposition that these passages are part of some diary, from which the general editor made extracts. Besides, there is no explanation in the Acts

which, in the slightest degree, connects the ἐγώ with the ἡμεῖς. To argue that explanation was unnecessary, as Theophilus and early readers were well acquainted with the fact that the author was a fellow-traveller with the Apostle, and, therefore, at once understood the meaning of "We," would destroy the utility of the direct form of communication altogether; for, if Theophilus knew this, there was obviously no need to introduce the first person at all in so abrupt and singular a way, more especially to chronicle minute details of journeys which possess comparatively little interest. Moreover, writing for Theophilus, we might reasonably expect that he should have stated where and when he became associated with Paul, and explained the reasons why he again left and rejoined him. Ewald suggests that possibly the author intended to have indicated his name more distinctly at the end of his work;[1] but this merely shows that, argue as he will, he feels the necessity for such an explanation. The conjecture is negatived, however, by the fact that no name is subsequently added. As in the case of the fourth Gospel, of course, the "incomparable modesty" theory is suggested as the reason why the author does not mention his own name, and explain the adoption of the first person in the ἡμεῖς passages; but to base theories such as this upon the modesty or elevated views of a perfectly unknown writer is obviously too arbitrary a proceeding to be permissible. There is, besides, exceedingly little modesty in a writer forcing himself so unnecessarily into notice, for he does not represent himself as taking any active part in the events narrated; and, as the mere chronicler of days of sailing and arriving, he might well have remained impersonal to the end.

On the other hand, supposing the general editor of the Acts to have made use of written sources of information, and, amongst others, of the diary of a companion of the Apostle Paul, it is not so strange that, for one reason or another, he should have allowed the original direct form of communication to stand whilst incorporating parts of it with his work. Instances have been pointed out in which a similar retention of the first or third person, in a narrative generally written otherwise, is accepted as the indication of a different written source, as, for instance, in Ezra vii. 27-ix.; Nehemiah viii.-x.; in the Book of Tobit i. 1-3, iii. 7 f., and other places;[2] and Schwanbeck has pointed out many instances of a similar kind amongst the chroniclers of the Middle Ages.[3] There are various ways in which the retention of the first person in these sections, supposing them to have been derived from some

[1] *Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vi., p. 34, anm. 1; *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, ix., p. 52.

[2] Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, 1864, i., p. 278; Hilgenfeld, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 607.

[3] *Quellen d. Schr. des Lukas*, i., p. 188 f.

other written source, might be explained. The simple supposition that the author, either through carelessness or oversight, allowed the ἡμεῖς to stand is not excluded; and, indeed, some critics maintain both the third Gospel and the Acts to be composed of materials derived from various sources and put together with little care or adjustment. The author might also have inserted these fragments of the diary of a fellow-traveller of Paul, and retained the original form of the document to strengthen the apparent credibility of his own narrative; or, as many critics believe, he may have allowed the first person of the original document to remain, in order himself to assume the character of eye-witness, and of companion of the Apostle. As we shall see in the course of our examination of the Acts, the general procedure of the author is by no means of a character to discredit such an explanation.

We shall not enter into any discussion of the sources from which critics maintain that the author compiled his work. It is sufficient to say that, whilst some profess to find definite traces of many documents, few if any deny that the writer made more or less use of earlier materials. It is quite true that the characteristics of the general author's style are found throughout the whole work. The Acts are no mere aggregate of scraps collected and rudely joined together, but the work of one author, in the sense that whatever materials he may have used for its composition were carefully assimilated, and subjected to thorough and systematic revision to adapt them to his purpose. But however completely this process was carried out, and his materials interpenetrated by his own peculiarities of style and language, he did not succeed in entirely obliterating the traces of independent written sources. Some writers maintain that there is a very apparent difference between the first twelve chapters and the remainder of the work, and profess to detect a much more Hebraistic character in the language of the earlier portion, although this is not received without demur. As regards the ἡμεῖς sections, whilst it is admitted that these fragments have in any case been much manipulated by the general editor, and largely contain his general characteristics of language, it is at the same time affirmed that they present distinct foreign peculiarities, which betray a borrowed document. Even critics who maintain the ἡμεῖς sections to be by the same writer who composed the rest of the book point out the peculiarly natural character and minute knowledge displayed in these passages, as distinguishing them from the rest of the Acts. This, of course, they attribute to the fact that the author there relates his personal experiences; but even with this explanation it is apparent that all who maintain the traditional view do recognise peculiarities in these sections,

by which they justify the ascription of them to an eye-witness. For the reasons which have been very briefly indicated, therefore, and upon other strong grounds, some of which will be presently stated, a very large mass of the ablest critics have concluded that the ἡμεῖς sections were not composed by the author of the rest of the Acts, but that they are part of the diary of some companion of the Apostle Paul, of which the author of Acts made use for his work, and that the general writer of the work, and consequently of the third Synoptic, was not Luke at all.

A careful study of the contents of the Acts cannot, we think, leave any doubt that the work could not have been written by any companion or intimate friend of the Apostle Paul. In here briefly indicating some of the reasons for this statement, we shall be under the necessity of anticipating, without much explanation or argument, points which will be more fully discussed further on, and which now, stated without preparation, may not be sufficiently clear to some readers. They may hereafter seem more conclusive. It is unreasonable to suppose that a friend or companion could have written so unhistorical and defective a history of the Apostle's life and teaching. The Pauline Epistles are nowhere directly referred to, but where we can compare the narrative and representations of Acts with the statements of the Apostle they are strikingly contradictory. His teaching in the one scarcely presents a trace of the strong and clearly defined doctrines of the other, and the character and conduct of the Paul of Acts are altogether different from those of Paul of the Epistles. According to Paul himself (Gal. i. 16–18), after his conversion he communicated not with flesh and blood, neither went up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before him, but immediately went away into Arabia, and returned to Damascus, and only after three years he went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, and abode with him fifteen days, during which visit none other of the Apostles did he see "save James, the brother of the Lord." If assurance of the correctness of these details were required, Paul gives it by adding (v. 20): "Now the things which I am writing to you, behold before God I lie not." According to Acts (ix. 19 30), however, the facts are quite different. Paul immediately begins to preach in Damascus, does not visit Arabia at all, but, on the contrary, goes to Jerusalem, where, under the protection of Barnabas (v. 26, 27), he is introduced to the Apostles, and "was with them going in and out." According to Paul (Gal. i. 22), his face was after that unknown unto the churches of Judæa, whereas, according to Acts, not only was he "going in and out" at Jerusalem with the Apostles, but (ix. 29) preached boldly in the name of the Lord, and (Acts xxvi. 20) "in Jerusalem and throughout all the region of Judæa" he urged to repentance. According to Paul (Gal. ii. 1 f.), after fourteen

years he went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus, "according to a revelation," and "privately" communicated his Gospel "to those who seemed to be something," as, with some irony, he calls the Apostles. In words still breathing irritation and determined independence, Paul relates to the Galatians the particulars of that visit—how great pressure had been exerted to compel Titus, though a Greek, to be circumcised, "that they might bring us into bondage," to whom "not even for an hour did we yield the required subjection." He protests, with proud independence, that the Gospel which he preaches was not received from man (Gal. i. 11, 12), but revealed to him by God (verses 15, 16); and during this visit (ii. 6, 7) "from those seeming to be something (τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι), whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me—God accepteth not man's person—for to me those who seemed (οἱ δοκοῦντες) communicated nothing additional." According to Acts, after his conversion Paul is taught by a man named Ananias what he must do (ix. 6, xxii. 10); he makes visits to Jerusalem (xi. 30, xii. 25, etc.), which are excluded by Paul's own explicit statements; and a widely different report is given (xv. 1 f.) of the second visit. Paul does not go, "according to a revelation," but is deputed by the Church of Antioch, with Barnabas, in consequence of disputes regarding the circumcision of Gentiles, to lay the case before the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem. It is almost impossible in the account here given of proceedings characterised throughout by perfect harmony, forbearance, and unanimity of views, to recognise the visit described by Paul. Instead of being private, the scene is a general council of the Church. The fiery independence of Paul is transformed into meekness and submission. There is not a word of the endeavour to compel him to have Titus circumcised—all is peace and undisturbed goodwill. Peter pleads the cause of Paul, and is more Pauline in his sentiments than Paul himself, and in the very presence of Paul claims to have been selected by God to be the Apostle of the Gentiles (xv. 7-11). Not a syllable is said of the scene at Antioch shortly after (Gal. ii. 11 f.), so singularly at variance with the proceedings of the council, when Paul withstood Cephas to the face. Then, who would recognise the Paul of the Epistles in the Paul of Acts, who makes such repeated journeys to Jerusalem to attend Jewish feasts (xviii. 21,[1] xix. 21, xx. 16, xxiv. 11, 17, 18); who, in his journeys, halts on the days when a Jew may not travel (xx. 5, 6); who shaves his head at Cenchrea because of a vow (xviii. 18); who, at the recommendation of the Apostles, performs that astonishing act of Nazariteship in the

[1] The Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrian, with other ancient codices, omit: "I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem."

Temple (xxi. 23), and afterwards follows it up by a defence of such "excellent dissembling" (xxiii. 6, xxiv. 11 f.); who circumcises Timothy, the son of a Greek and of a Jewess, with his own hands (xvi. 1–3, cf. Gal. v. 2); and who is so little the apostle of the uncircumcision that he only tardily goes to the Gentiles when rejected by the Jews (cf. xviii. 6). Paul is not only robbed of the honour of being the first Apostle of the Gentiles, which is conferred upon Peter, but the writer seems to avoid even calling him an apostle at all, the only occasions upon which he does so being indirect (xiv. 4, 14); and the title equally applied to Barnabas, whose claim to it is more than doubted. The passages in which this occurs, moreover, are not above suspicion, "the Apostles" being omitted in Cod. D. (Bezæ) from xiv. 14. The former verse in that codex has important variations from other MSS.

If we cannot believe that the representation actually given of Paul in the Acts could proceed from a friend or companion of the Apostle, it is equally impossible that such a person could have written his history with so many extraordinary imperfections and omissions. We have already pointed out that between chs. ix.–xiv. are compressed the events of seventeen of the most active years of the Apostle's life, and also that a long period is comprised within the ἡμεῖς sections, during which such minute details of the daily itinerary are given. The incidents reported, however, are quite disproportionate to those which are omitted. We have no record, for instance, of his visit to Arabia at so interesting a portion of his career (Gal. i. 17), although the particulars of his conversion are repeated with singular variations no less than three times (ix., xxii., xxvi.); nor of his preaching in Illyria (Rom. xv. 19); nor of the incident referred to in Rom. xvi. 3, 4. The momentous adventures in the cause of the Gospel spoken of in 2 Cor. xi. 23 f. receive scarcely any illustration in Acts, nor is any notice taken of his fighting with wild beasts at Ephesus (1 Cor. xv. 32), which would have formed an episode full of serious interest. What, again, was "the affliction which happened in Asia," which so overburdened even so energetic a nature as that of the Apostle that "he despaired even of life"? (2 Cor. ii. 8 f.). Some light upon these points might reasonably have been expected from a companion of Paul. Then, xvii. 14–16, xviii. 5, contradict 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2, in a way scarcely possible in such a companion, present with the Apostle at Athens; and in like manner the representation in xxviii. 17–22 is inconsistent with such a person, ignoring as it does the fact that there already was a Christian Church in Rome (Ep. to Romans). We do not refer to the miraculous elements so thickly spread over the narrative of the Acts, and especially in the episode xvi. 25 f., which is inserted in the first ἡμεῖς section, as irreconcilable with the

character of an eye-witness, because it is precisely the miraculous portion of the book which is on its trial; but we may ask whether it would have been possible for such a friend, acquainted with the Apostle's representations in 1 Cor. xiv. 2 f., cf. xii. xiv., and the phenomena there described, to speak of the gift of "tongues" at Pentecost as the power of speaking different languages (ii. 4-11, cf. x. 46, xix. 6)?

It will readily be understood that we have here merely rapidly, and by way of illustration, referred to a few of the points which seem to preclude the admission that the general author of the Acts could be an eye-witness, or companion of the Apostle Paul; and this will become more apparent as we proceed, and more closely examine the contents of the book. Who that author was, there are now no means of ascertaining. The majority of critics who have most profoundly examined the problem presented by the Acts, however, and who do not admit Luke to be the general author, are agreed that the author compiled the ἡμεῖς sections from a diary kept by some companion of the Apostle Paul during the journeys and voyages to which they relate, but opinion is very divided as to the person to whom that diary must be ascribed. It is, of course, recognised that the various theories regarding his identity are merely based upon conjecture, but they have long severely exercised critical ingenuity. A considerable party adopt the conclusion that the diary was probably written by Luke. This theory has certainly the advantage of whatever support may be derived from tradition; and it has been conjectured, not without probability, that this diary, being either written by, or originally attributed to, Luke, may possibly have been the source from which, in course of time, the whole of the Acts, and consequently the Gospel, came to be ascribed to Luke. The selection of a comparatively less known name than that of Timothy, Titus, or Silas, for instance, may thus be explained; but, besides, it has the great advantage that, the name of Luke never being mentioned in the Acts, he is not exposed to criticism, which has found serious objections to the claims of other better known followers of Paul.

There are many critics who find difficulties in the way of accepting Luke as the author of the "we" sections, and who adopt the theory that they were probably composed by Timothy. It is argued that, if Luke had been the writer of this diary, he must have been in very close relations to Paul, having been his companion during the Apostle's second mission, as well as during the later European journey, and finally during the eventful voyage of Paul as a prisoner from Cæsarea to Rome. Under these circumstances, it is natural to expect that Paul should mention him in his earlier epistles, written

before the Roman imprisonment, but this he nowhere does. For instance, no reference is made to Luke in either of the letters to the Corinthians, nor in those to the Thessalonians; but, on the other hand, Timothy's name, together with that of Silvanus (or Silas), is joined to Paul's in the two letters to the Thessalonians, besides being mentioned in the body of the first Epistle (iii. 2, 6); and he is repeatedly and affectionately spoken of in the earlier letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10), and his name is likewise combined with the Apostle's in the second Epistle (2 Cor. i. 1), as well as mentioned in the body of the letter, along with that of Silvanus, as a fellow-preacher with Paul. In the Epistle to the Philippians, later, the name of Luke does not appear, although, had he been the companion of the Apostle from Troas, he must have been known to the Philippians; but, on the other hand, Timothy is again associated in the opening greeting of that Epistle. Timothy is known to have been a fellow-worker with the Apostle, and to have accompanied him in his missionary journeys; and he is repeatedly mentioned in the Acts as the companion of Paul, and the first occasion is precisely where the ἡμεῖς sections commence.[1] In connection with Acts xv. 40, xvi. 3, 10, it is considered that Luke is quite excluded from the possibility of being the companion who wrote the diary we are discussing, by the Apostle's own words in 2 Cor. i. 19: "For the Son of God, Christ Jesus, who was preached among you by us, by me and Silvanus and Timothy," etc. The eye-witness who wrote the journal from which the ἡμεῖς sections are taken must have been with the Apostle in Corinth, and, it is of course always asserted, must have been one of his συνεργοί, and preached the Gospel. Is it possible, on the supposition that this fellow-labourer was Luke, that the Apostle could in so marked a manner have excluded his name by clearly defining that "us" only meant himself and Silvanus and Timothy? Mayerhoff[2] has gone even further than the critics we have referred to, and maintains Timothy to be the author of the third Synoptic and of Acts.

We may add that some writers have conjectured Silas to be the author of the ἡμεῖς sections, and others have referred them to Titus. It is evident that, whether the ἡμεῖς sections be by the unknown author of the rest of the Acts or be part of a diary by some unknown companion of Paul, introduced into the work by the general editor, they do not solve the problem as to the identity of the author, who remains absolutely unknown.

It may be well here to state various other reasons which seem to confirm this result, and to indicate a later date than is usually

[1] xvi. 1 f.; cf. xvii. 14, 15; xviii. 5; xix. 22; xx. 4.
[2] *Einl. petr. Schriften*, p. 6 f.

assigned to the composition both of the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles.

We learn from the prologue to the Gospel, i. 1–3, that, before it was composed, a considerable evangelical literature had already come into existence. It seems evident, from the expressions used, that the generation of those who, as eye-witnesses, delivered (*παρέδοσαν*) the reports upon which the Gospel narratives were based, had already passed away, and at least a second generation had undertaken to put them into writing, to which, at the very most, the writer may, in accordance with his own words, have belonged. It must be observed, however, that the passage by no means limits us to close proximity in time between the writer and those who delivered the substance of the Gospel narratives; but, on the contrary, in representing that "many" had previously undertaken to set them forth, a considerable lapse of time is necessarily implied. When we look further into the Gospel, we find unmistakable indications that the work was written long after the destruction of Jerusalem, and that variations introduced into the eschatological speeches put into the mouth of Jesus were modifications after the event. Let the reader carefully compare Matthew xxiv. 15 f., Mark xiii. 14 f., with Luke xxi. 20 f., where it is said, verse 20, "And when ye shall see Jerusalem, compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is at hand"; and in verse 24, "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led captive into all the nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden by Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."[1] We have here a much more precise statement of facts than the mysterious reference in the other Synoptics written at an early period after the fall of the Holy City. The destruction of Jerusalem not only has taken place, but the place has long been trodden by the Gentiles. Had its fall only been recent, there would have been no motive for postponing the fulfilment of the prophecy; but a long time had passed away, and there was no immediate prospect of change, so the accomplishment was assigned to the vague epoch when "the times of the Gentiles" should be "fulfilled." In the first two Synoptics the second advent and the end of all things are closely connected with the destruction of Jerusalem, whereas in the third they are carefully separated. The first Gospel says, xxiv. 29, "And immediately (*εὐθέως*) after the tribulation of those days" the end shall come.

[1] In Matt. xxiv. 3 the disciples inquire: "When shall these things be? and what the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?" In Luke xxi. 7: "When shall these things be? and what the sign when these are about to come to pass?" The words quoted in the text from xxi. 24 are those which, according to several, determine that the work cannot have been written after the rebuilding of Ælia Capitolina.

The second Synoptic has, xiii. 24, "But in these days (ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις), after that tribulation," etc.; but the third Gospel no longer connects these events with the second coming (cf. Luke xxi. 25), but rather seems to oppose the representation of the first Synoptic; for, after referring to the wars and tumults (Luke xxi. 9), the writer adds, "but the end is not immediately (οὐκ εὐθέως)"; and earlier (xvii. 20 f.), to the question of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, Jesus replies: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation, nor shall they say, Lo here, lo there! for behold, the kingdom of God is within you." The passage in Matt. x. 23, "But when they persecute you in this city, flee into the other; for verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come," which might have seemed suitable in some primitive Gospel, from which probably our first synoptist derived it, has now lost all significance, and is altogether omitted by the third, although he evidently wishes to give the discourses of Jesus with the greatest fulness. In the fourth Gospel, still more, all such sayings are omitted, as no longer applicable through lapse of time. The third synoptist likewise omits such details of that which is to take place after the coming of the Son of Man as are given in the other two Gospels (Matt. xxiv. 30, 31; Mark xiii. 27); and even the words of the first and second Synoptics, Matt. xxiv. 33, "When ye shall see all these things, know that he is near at the doors" (cf. Mark xiii. 29), are modified into (xxi. 28), "And when these things begin to come to pass, look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth near"; ver. 31, "When ye shall see these things coming to pass, know that the kingdom of God is near." It is difficult impartially to note such altogether peculiar and characteristic alterations of these eschatological sayings, without recognising that they proceed from a marked change in the historical circumstances at the time of the writer, which rendered such modifications necessary to preserve the significance of the prophecies. That these variations arose from such influence, and are indicative of a later period, is a fact recognised by able critics of all schools. We might add various other passages which show, by their modifications, an advanced stage of Christian development. For instance, the third Synoptic has, vi. 21: "Blessed are ye that hunger *now*, for ye shall be filled; blessed are ye that weep *now*, for ye shall laugh. 22. Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of Man's sake" (cf. Matt. v. 4, 6, 11). It is scarcely possible to ignore the special application of these passages to Christians who had already been subjected to persecutions and reproach, not only in the insertion of the

significant νῦν, but still more in verse 22 compared with Matt. v. 11.[1] And, again, a similar modification exists in Luke xii. 3. The first Gospel (x. 27) has, "What I tell you in the darkness speak in the light; and what ye hear in the ear, preach upon the housetops." This is altogether omitted by the second synoptist, and it had so little significance left for the third, when Christianity, which had once been taught secretly and in private, had long been so widely preached that even the passage Matt. x. 23 had to be erased, that it was altered to (xii. 3): "Therefore, whatsoever ye said (εἴπατε) in the darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye spake (ἐλαλήσατε) in the ear in the closets shall be proclaimed upon the housetops."

Along with these alterations and modifications which directly tend to push back the limits of the prophecies, and yet to leave room for their long-delayed fulfilment, the third synoptist still retains the final indication of the first and second Gospels,[2] xxi. 32: "Verily I say unto you that this generation (ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη) shall not pass away till all be fulfilled." Whilst the ablest critics, therefore, to a great extent agree that the variations elsewhere introduced by the third synoptist demonstrate the standpoint of a later age, a difference of opinion arises as to how far back the writer could be removed from the destruction of Jerusalem, without exceeding the line drawn, in the verse just quoted, by the words "this generation." On the one hand, it is maintained that many of that generation, who had been direct eye-witnesses of the appearance of Jesus, must still have been alive when this was written to justify the expression. How did the writer interpret the traditional γενεὰ αὕτη, which he still retained, within which the second advent was to take place? As he omitted Matt. x. 23 and modified in such a manner the eschatological prophecies, it is obvious that, if he intelligently retained the term "this generation," he must have understood it in its widest sense, and this we shall find he was justified in doing by the practice of the time. It has been, we think, clearly proved by Baur and others[3] that the word γενεά was understood to express the duration of the longest life, like the Latin *saeculum*.[4] Baur rightly argues that the generation would not be considered as "passed away" so long as even one of

[1] Ewald, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, iii., p. 144.

[2] Cf. Matt. xxiv. 34; Mark xiii. 30.

[3] Baur, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1849, p. 317 f.; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 367 f.; *Die Evangelien*, p. 212; *Einl. N. T.*, p. 609; Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1852, p. 229; *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 467.

[4] Baur quotes Censorinus, a writer of the third century: "*Saeculum est spatium vitae humanae longissimum partu et morte definitum. Quare qui annos triginta saeculum putarunt, multum videntur errasse*" (*De die Nat.*, c. 17; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1849, p. 318, anm. 1).

that generation remained alive. Now, the fact is, as he points out, that if the Apostle John was still living at the beginning of Trajan's reign, the date of his death being commonly set A.D. 99–100, many who read John xxi. 23 long after that period may very probably have supposed him to be still alive. Indeed, that passage of the fourth Gospel, indicative of a belief in the advent within the lifetime of the Apostle, has a direct bearing upon the interpretation which we are discussing. According to Hegesippus,[1] again, Symeon of Jerusalem was martyred under Trajan A.D. 107, at the age of 120 years, he says, and he was one of the "generation" in question, as was also Ignatius, if the tradition regarding him is to be believed, who died a martyr A.D. 115–116. Then Quadratus, who presented an Apology to the Emperor Hadrian about A.D. 126, states, in a fragment preserved by Eusebius, that some of those who were healed by Jesus were still living in his own times.[2] A writer at the end of the first quarter of the second century, therefore, might consider that the generation had not yet passed away. Hilgenfeld[3] points out that Irenæus, in the last book of his great work, written at the very end of the second century, speaking of the Apocalyptic vision, says: "For it is not a long time ago it was seen, but nearly in our own generation (γενεά), towards the end of Domitian's († 96) reign."[4] Irenæus, therefore, speaks of something which he supposes to happen about a century before, as all but in his own γενεά, and it must be noted that the phrase ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς is rendered in the ancient Latin version: "*sed pene sub nostro sæculo.*" Another instance occurs in the remarks of Hegesippus preserved by Eusebius. Hegesippus says that the Church remained pure from heresy till the generation (γενεά) of those who had heard the Apostles had passed away,[5] and this he dates in the reign of Trajan. The expression in Luke xxi. 32 is not, we think, in contradiction with the late date to which other potent considerations seem to assign the third Synoptic. It will be seen that the internal evidence supplied by the Acts of the Apostles still further confirms the indications of a late date in the Gospel itself.

The Acts of the Apostles being the δεύτερος λόγος, of course, it was composed later than the Gospel; and there is good reason for believing that a considerable interval occurred before the second work was written. According to the traditional view, some ten years probably elapsed between the production of the two works, and the interval could certainly not well be less. It will be remembered that the author not only repeats particulars of the

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii., 32. [2] *Ib.*, iv. 3. [3] *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 367 f.
[4] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, v. 30, § 3; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 18; v. 8.
[5] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 32.

Ascension, but that the account of it which is given in Acts i. 3–9 differs materially from that of the Gospel. The names of the Twelve, moreover, are detailed (i. 13), although they had already been given in the former work, vi. 14–16. One or two curious modifications are further made, which certainly indicate a more advanced period. The author represents the disciples as asking the risen Jesus (i. 6): "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" To which answer is made: "It is not for you to know times or seasons which the Father appointed by his own authority. But ye shall receive power through the coming upon you of the Holy Ghost, and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem and in all Judæa and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." Having spoken this, Jesus is immediately lifted up, and a cloud receives him out of their sight. We believe that the chief motive for which this singular episode was introduced was to correct the anticipations raised by the eschatological prophecies in chap. xxi. of the Gospel. These prophecies had already been modified, as we have seen, to suit the altered circumstances of the times, and the inconvenient expression "this generation" is quietly removed. There is no longer any definite limitation in the statement, "It is not for you to know times or seasons," accompanied by the vista of testimony to be borne, "unto the uttermost parts of the earth." We are here, unmistakably, in the second century, to which also the whole character of the Acts leads us.

There is an allusion to Gaza in the Acts which has been much discussed, and also advanced as an indication of date. In the account of the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch the angel is represented as saying to Philip (viii. 26): "Arise and go toward the south, unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem to Gaza, which is desert (*αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος*)." The city of Gaza, after having been taken and destroyed by Alexander the Great, was rebuilt by the pro-consul Gabinius[1] (c. 58 B.C.), but it was again destroyed, by the Jews themselves, shortly before the siege of Jerusalem.[2] The expression, "this is desert," may grammatically be applied either to the "way" or to "Gaza" itself. Those who consider that *ἔρημος* refers to Gaza, of course understand the word as describing the devastated condition of the place, and some of them argue that, as the latest date referred to in Acts, the two years' imprisonment of Paul, carries the history up to A.D. 64, and the destruction of Gaza took place about A.D. 66—probably somewhat later—the description was applied to Gaza by the author as a parenthetic allusion, its destruction being quite recent at the time when the Acts were written. On the other side, it is

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.*, xiv. 5, § 3. [2] *Ib. Bell. Jud.*, ii. 18, § 1.

contended that, as there was more than one way—as there still is—from Jerusalem to Gaza, the angel simply indicated the particular way by which Philip was to go so as to meet the Ethiopian: "this way is desert," and consequently little frequented. Applied to the way and identifying it, the description has direct and perfectly simple significance; whereas, understood as a reference to the state of Gaza itself, it is certainly an unnecessary display of local or historical knowledge. The majority of critics connect ἔρημος with ὁδός, and not with Gaza:[1] but in any case the expression has really no value for the establishment of a date, for, even supposing the words applied to Gaza, there is no limit to the time when such a reference might have been made. A writer at the middle of the second century, for instance, describing an episode supposed to occur near Gaza, and knowing of its destruction from Josephus, or possibly having it suggested by some older legend, might have inserted the detail, whether applied to Gaza or to the road to it, as a dash of local colouring.

We now arrive at the point which suggested the present discussion: the apparent indications of contact between Luke and Josephus. Holtzmann and others[2] have pointed out that the author of the Gospel and Acts has been very sensibly influenced by the works of Josephus, which were certainly largely circulated in Rome, where most critics conjecture that our two canonical books were written. Supposing the use of the writings of the Jewish historian to be demonstrated, it is obvious that we have a very important fact to guide us in determining an epoch beyond which the composition of the third Synoptic cannot be set. It must be borne in mind, in considering such evidence as we can afford space to quote, that indications of the use of an original historian, using his own characteristic expressions, and largely relating his own experiences, may be accepted in quite a different way from supposed indications of the use of Gospels like ours, which not only almost literally reproduce the same matter, showing their mutual dependence upon each other and upon common sources of which we positively know the earlier existence, but profess to give a historical record of sayings and doings which might have been, and in all probability were, similarly reported in a dozen different works, or handed down by common tradition.

It is recognised by almost all modern writers that the author of the third Synoptic and Acts was not a Jew, but a Gentile Christian. Where did he get such knowledge of Jewish history as he

[1] Some able critics are disposed to consider the words αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος a mere gloss which has crept into the text. We need not discuss the argument that it distinguished the particular Gaza intended.

[2] Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. Wiss. Theol.*, 1873, p. 89 f.; Krenkel, *Zeitschr. Wiss. Theol.*, 1873, p. 141 f.; Hausrath, *N. T. Zeitgesch.* iii., p. 423 f.

displays? The reply is: he got it from the works of Josephus. The whole of the historical personages introduced into his two books, as well as the references to contemporary events, are found in those works, and, although sometimes erroneously employed and distorted from his pious point of view, there still remain singular coincidences of expression and of sequence, which show the effect upon the author's memory of his study of Josephus. The high priests, Annas, Caiaphas, and Ananias; Gamaliel; the two Herods; Agrippa and Philip, together with Herodias, Berenice, and Drusilla; and the Roman Procurators, Felix and Festus;[1] Simon the Magician,[2] and the Egyptian (Acts xxi. 38), Theudas, and Judas the Galilæan, as well as others, seen to be derived from this source, together with such facts as the enrolment under Cyrenius, and the great famine (Acts xi. 28).[3] Josephus furnishes the material for drawing the character of Ananias, who commanded those who stood by to smite (*τύπτειν*) Paul on the mouth, and was characterised by the apostle in such strong terms:

[1] The whole of the preceding personages, indeed, figure largely in the first five chapters of Book xviii. of the *Antiquities*. The condensed references in Luke iii. 1, 2, do not represent many pages of Josephus. It is curious to compare iii. 1, *ἐν ἔτει δὲ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ..... καὶ τετραρχοῦντος τῆς Γαλιλαίας Ἡρῴδου, Φιλίππου δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ τετραρχοῦντος τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας, κ.τ.λ.*, with the following of Josephus: *τότε δὲ καὶ Φίλιππος (Ἡρῴδου δὲ ἦν ἀδελφός) τελευτᾷ τὸν βίον, εἰκοστῷ μὲν ἐνιαυτῷ τῆς Τιβερίου ἀρχῆς ἡγησάμενος δὲ αὐτὰς ἑπτὰ καὶ τριάκοντα τῆς Τραχωνίτιδος καὶ Γαυλανίτιδος, κ.τ.λ.*, *Antiq.* xviii. 4, § 6 "Now at that time also Philip, who was Herod's brother, died, in the twentieth year of the reign of Tiberius, after having for thirty-seven years governed the region of Trachonitis and Gaulonitis," etc. Lysanias of Abylene is referred to in *Antiq.* xix. 5, § 1; xx. 7, § 1; and Annas and Caiaphas in an earlier paragraph of the same chapter we have just quoted (xviii. 4, § 3; cf. 2, §§ 1, 2, etc.). The story of Herodias is told in the next chapter (xviii. 5, § 1 f.; cf. 7, § 1; cf. Luke iii. 19 f.). From *Antiq.* xx. 7, § 2, may be learnt why Felix trembled, when he came with his wife Drusilla, and Paul discoursed to him of righteousness and temperance (Acts xxiv. 24 f.). Berenice is mentioned in the very same section (*Antiq.* xx. 7, § 2, cf. Acts xxiv. 23). In Acts xxiv. 27 Festus is introduced: "But after two years Porcius Festus came in Felix' room" (*διετίας δὲ πληρωθείσης ἔλαβεν διάδοχον ὁ Φῆλιξ Πόρκιον Φῆστον*). He is introduced by Josephus: "But Porcius Festus having been sent by Nero in Felix' room" (*Πορκίου δὲ Φήστου διαδόχου Φήλικι πεμφθέντος ὑπο Νέρωνος, κ.τ.λ.*). *Antiq.*, xx. 8, § 9.

[2] We shall not here discuss the historical reality of Simon the magician, cf. Acts viii. 9 f., but in Josephus there is likewise Simon a magician, who helps Felix to marry Drusilla. The author of Acts introduces him, viii. 9: "But a certain man named Simon (*ὀνόματι Σίμων*).....using sorcery (*μαγεύων*) .. .. boasting himself to be some great person (*λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν*)." Josephus says: "And one of his friends, named Simon (*Σίμων ὀνόματι*)..... who pretended to be a sorcerer (*μάγον εἶναι σκηπτόμενον*)," etc., *Antiq.*, xx. 7, § 2.

[3] The third synoptist is the only evangelist who records the excursion to Emmaus, and it may be mentioned that the name of this village, even, may have been derived from Josephus, *Antiq.*, xiii. 1, § 3; *De Bello Jud.*, v. 2, § 3.

and Josephus even states that the servants of the high priest smote (τύπτειν) those priests who would not give up their tithes (xx. 9, § 2 f.).[1]

The manner in which the author of Acts deals with Theudas and Judas the Galilæan is very instructive. Not only does he commit a palpable anachronism in placing the name of Theudas in the mouth of Gamaliel, as that popular leader did not appear till many years after the time when Gamaliel is represented as speaking, but he also commits a second anachronism by making Judas come after Theudas, and that he does so his μετὰ τοῦτον, "after this man," leaves no doubt. How did this error originate? Simply from imperfect reading or recollection of Josephus, who mentions Theudas, and then, in the next paragraph, the sons of Judas the Galilæan; and as Josephus proceeds to describe the Judas whom he means, the author of Acts has confused the father with the sons. A little examination of the passage, we think, shows beyond doubt that this is the source of the reference. The author of Acts makes Gamaliel say (v. 36): "For before those days rose up Theudas, boasting himself to be somebody (Θευδᾶς, λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτόν), to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves; who was slain (ὃς ἀνῃρέθη), and all, as many as were persuaded by him (καὶ πάντες ὅσοι ἐπείθοντο αὐτῷ), were dispersed (διελύθησαν), and brought to nought." Josephus says: "A certain man, a magician, named Theudas, persuades the great multitude (πείθει τὸν πλεῖστον ὄχλον)..... to follow him to the river Jordan; for he boasted that he was a prophet (προφήτης γὰρ ἔλεγεν εἶναι).....Fadus, however, attacking them unexpectedly, slew many and took many prisoners; Theudas also being taken prisoner, they cut off his head," etc.[2] A few lines further down Josephus continues: "But, besides these, the sons of Judas, the Galilæan, also were slain (οἱ παῖδες Ἰούδα τοῦ Γαλιλαίου ἀνῃρέθησαν), (I mean), of the (Judas) who drew away the people (τὸν λαὸν ἀποστήσαντος) from the Romans, when Cyrenius assessed," etc.[3] In Acts, Gamaliel, after speaking of Theudas, as quoted above, goes on to say: "After this man (μετὰ τοῦτον), rose up Judas the Galilæan (Ἰούδας ὁ Γαλιλαῖος) in the days of the enrolment, and drew away people (ἀπέστησεν λαὸν) after him; he also perished, and all, as many as were persuaded (ἐπείθοντο) by him, were scattered (διεσκορπίσθησαν)." This account of the fate of Judas and his followers differs from that elsewhere given by Josephus,[4] and to which he refers in the section above quoted; but this confirms the

[1] Hausrath, *N. T. Zeitgesch.* xii. p. 425 f., cf. p. 32. [2] *Antiq.* xx. 5, § 1.
[3] *Ib.* xx. 5, § 2; cf. xviii. 1, §§ 1, 6; *De Bello Jud.*, ii. 8, § 1; Luke ii. 2.
[4] *Antiq.* xviii. 1, §§ 1, 6.

belief that the author of Acts took it, as has been said, from this chapter, applying to Judas himself the statement made regarding his sons.[1]

Not only does the author of Acts know the history of Felix and Drusilla, but in saying (xxiv. 26) that Felix sent frequently for Paul, hoping that money would be given to him, he merely follows the suggestion of Josephus, who openly accuses Felix both of treachery and bribery.[2] From the same chapter is derived another incident. In Acts xxi. 38 the chief captain, who takes Paul prisoner at Jerusalem after the riot in the temple, says to him: "Art not thou that Egyptian who before these days madest an uproar, and leddest out into the wilderness (*εἰς τὴν ἔρημον*) the four thousand men of the *sicarii* (*τῶν σικαρίων*)?" Josephus relates the story of the unnamed Egyptian in two of his works. He describes[3] how robbers and impostors filled Jerusalem with violence, and he states that these robbers were called *sicarii* (*σικάριοι*), giving an explanation of the origin of the word.[4] These impostors persuaded the multitude to follow them into the wilderness (*εἰς τὴν ἐρημίαν*).[5] About this time, he says, there came out of Egypt one "boasting that he was a prophet" (*προφήτης εἶναι λέγων*), and induced a multitude to follow him. Felix attacks the Egyptian (*τὸν Αἰγύπτιον*), and slays four hundred, taking two hundred prisoners, but the Egyptian himself escapes. A little lower down Josephus says that Festus sent soldiers against a number of the *sicarii*, who had been induced by a certain impostor to follow him "as far as the desert" (*μέχρι τῆς ἐρημίας*).[6] In his work on the Jewish wars he gives a similar account.

The exordium of the orator Tertullus (Acts xxiv. 2, 3), who appears, with the Jews, to accuse Paul after his removal to Cæsarea, is a clear, though hyperbolic, reference to the efforts of Felix to put down these *sicarii* and impostors, described by Josephus in connection with the passage above quoted.[7]

The author of Acts further seems to show his use of the works of Josephus in his estimate (xiii. 20) of 450 years as the period of the Judges of Israel, which is a round statement of the data of Josephus, *Antiq.*, xiii. 3, § 1, in opposition to the reckoning of 1 Kings vi. 1; and again in the next verse, xiii. 21, the author

[1] Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. Wiss. Theol.*, 1873, p. 80 f.

[2] *Antiq.*, xx. 8, § 5. Cf. Hausrath, *N. T. Zeitgesch.*, iii., p. 426.

[3] *Antiq.*, xx. 8. [4] *Ib.*, xx. 8, §§ 5, 6, 10.

[5] Τὸν ὄχλον ἔπειθον αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἐρημίαν ἕπεσθαι, *ib.*, § 6.

[6] *Antiq.*, xx. 8, §§ 5, 6, 10; *De Bello Jud.*, ii. 13, §§ 3, 4, 5; Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. Wiss. Theol.*, 1873, p. 91.

[7] *Antiq.*, xx. 8; *De Bello Jud.*, ii. 13; Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. Wiss. Theol.*, 1873, p. 91.

says that Saul reigned forty years, which is nowhere else stated than by Josephus, *Antiq.*, vi. 14, § 9.[1]

In the prophecies of the fall of Jerusalem (Luke xix. 43, xxi. 43 f.), is it not probable that the author profits by his knowledge of the works of Josephus? His reference (xxi. 11) to the omens which are to presage that event, "and there shall be fearful sights and great signs (σημεῖα μεγάλα) from heaven," appears to us an unmistakable echo of the account given by the Jewish historian of the signs (σημεῖα), the extraordinary appearances in the heavens, and the wonderful occurrences which took place in the Temple before the siege of the Holy City.[2] Other reminiscences of the same writer may perhaps be traced in the same chapter, as, for instance, xxi. 5: "and as some were remarking of the Temple that it was adorned with goodly stones and offerings (ὅτι λίθοις καλοῖς καὶ ἀναθήμασιν κεκόσμηται), etc." Josephus describes the Temple as built of stones which were "white and strong," and he says that it was adorned with many coloured veils (ποικίλοις ἐμπετάσμασι κεκόσμητο), and, giving an account of the golden vine which ornamented the pillars, he adds that none seemed to have so adorned (ἐπικεκοσμηκέναι) the Temple as Herod. After saying that round the whole were hung up the spoils taken from barbarous peoples, Josephus states: "and all these King Herod offered (ἀνέθηκε) to the Temple."[3]

There are many other points which might be quoted as indicating the use of Josephus; but we have already devoted too much space to this question, and must now conclude. There is one other indication, however, which seems to show that the author of our third Synoptic and Acts was acquainted with, and influenced by, the works of the Jewish historian. M. Renan has pointed out the dedication to Theophilus, which he rightly considers altogether foreign to Syrian and Palestinian habits, as recalling the dedication of the works of Josephus to Epaphroditus, and probably showing a Roman practice.[4] We consider that it indicates much more. The third Gospel and Acts are dedicated to the "most excellent Theophilus" (κράτιστε Θεόφιλε), for whose information they were written.[5] Josephus dedicates his work on the Antiquities to the "most excellent Epaphroditus" (κράτιστε Ἐπαφρόδιτε),[6] for whose information, also, the work was written.[7] He still more

[1] Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. Wiss. Theol.*, 1873, p. 92; Hausrath, *N. T. Zeitgesch.*, iii., p. 426, anm. 4; cf. Hales, *Analysis of Chronology*, 1830, i., p. 300.

[2] *De Bello Jud.*, vi. 5, §§ 3, 4,

[3] *Antiq.*, xv. 11, § 3; Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. Wiss. Theol.*, 1873, p. 92.

[4] *Les Evangiles, et la Seconde Génération Chrétienne*, p. 255 f.

[5] Luke i. 3, 4; Acts i. 1.

[6] *Vita*, § 76. The amplification ἀνδρῶν is of no importance.

[7] *Antiq. Proœm.*, § 2.

directly dedicates to the same "most excellent Epaphroditus" (*κράτιστε Ἐπαφ.*) his work against Apion, and he begins the second book: "Now in the former book, most esteemed Epaphroditus, regarding, etc. (*Διὰ μὲν οὖν τοῦ προτέρου Βιβλίου, τιμιώτατέ μοι Ἐπαφρόδιτε, περί κ. τ. λ.*).....I also made (*ἐποιησάμην*) a refutation, etc."[1] Our author begins his second work (Acts i. 1): "The former treatise I made, O Theophilus, regarding all, etc. (*Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων, ὦ Θεόφιλε, κ. τ. λ.*)." It is, we think, impossible to examine carefully the commencement of the first book against Apion, and the statement of the reasons which induced him to write his history, without perceiving the influence which Josephus had exercised over the mind and language of our canonical writer, and how closely that introduction is imitated in the prologue to the Gospel and Acts, in which the author speaks in the first person, and probably displays himself more directly than elsewhere. It is much too long to quote, and only a very inadequate idea of the similarity of tone and expression in many parts can be conveyed by the few words which can be extracted here. Speaking of Greek literature he says: "Certainly those taking in hand (*ἐπιχειρήσαντες*) to write histories," etc. A few lines lower down he refers to the boasting of the Greeks that they are the only people versed in ancient times, and accurately delivering the truth regarding them (*ὡς μόνους ἐπισταμένους τὰ ἀρχαῖα καὶ ἀλήθειαν περὶ αὐτῶν ἀκριβῶς παραδιδόντας*).[2] He speaks of writing history from the beginning of most distant times (*ἐκ μακροτάτων ἄνωθεν χρόνων*) amongst the Egyptians and Babylonians, and he says it was undertaken (*ἐγκεχειρισμένοι*) by the priests; the records of the Jews, also, were written with great accuracy (*μετὰ πολλῆς ἀκριβείας*).[3] Going on to speak more particularly of himself, Josephus says:—

"But certain worthless men have taken in hand (*ἐπικεχειρήκασιν*) to calumniate my history .....he who undertakes the delivery (*παράδοσιν*) of facts to others ought himself in the first place to know them accurately (*ἀκριβῶς*), either from having followed the events (*παρηκολουθηκότα τοῖς γεγονόσιν*), or from having ascertained them by inquiry of those who knew them.....But I write the history of the war, as an actor in many of the occurrences, and eye-witness of most (*πλείστων δ' αὐτόπτης γενόμενος*).....Must they not, therefore, be considered audacious who have taken in hand (*ἐπικεχειρηκότας*) to contend with me regarding the truth of my history?"[4]

If we linguistically examine the prologue to the Gospel, addressed to the "most excellent Theophilus," we find some instructive peculiarities. In the first verse, we have the verb *ἐπιχειρεῖν*, which is nowhere else used in the Gospel, only twice in Acts (ix. 29; xix. 13), and not at all in the rest of

[1] *Contra Apionem*, ii. 1. [2] *Ib.*, i., § 3. [3] *Ib.*, § 6. [4] *Ib.*, i. 10.

the New Testament. In the introduction to his work against Apion, however, addressed by Josephus to the "most excellent Epaphroditus," it is employed four times in the first eleven paragraphs,[1] and we do not here refer to any other part. Αὐτόπτης is not met with anywhere in the New Testament except in Luke i. 2, but it is likewise found in close connection with the other parallels in the work against Apion.[2] Except in Luke i. 3, παρακολουθεῖν does not occur in any part of that Gospel or of Acts, and only in three other places of the New Testament.[3] It is found in the same section as the above, and further in two other passages just quoted.[4] Ἀκριβῶς occurs in Luke i. 3 and Acts xviii. 25, but nowhere else in the two books, and, besides, only once in the rest of the New Testament;[5] but it also is met with twice in the sections against Apion referred to,[6] which probably suggested the whole prologue.

We have left very many important analogies unmentioned which merit examination; but those which have been pointed out, we think, leave little doubt that the author of the third Synoptic and Acts was acquainted with, and made use of, the works of Josephus. Now, the history of the Jewish war was written about A.D. 75, the *Antiquities* about A.D. 93, the *Life* at a still later period, and last of all the work against Apion, probably at the very end of the first century. If, then, it be admitted, as we think it must be, that the author of the third Gospel made use of these works of Josephus, we have at once the beginning of the second century as the very earliest date at which the third Synoptic could have been written, and the Acts of the Apostles must necessarily be assigned to a still later date. At what precise period of the second century they were composed we cannot here pause to consider, even if the materials for determining the point exist; but the reasons now given, and many other considerations, point surely to a date when it is scarcely possible that the Acts of the Apostles could have been written by a companion of the Apostle Paul, and much less the third Gospel of our canon.[7]

We have said enough to enable the reader to understand the

[1] § 2, 10 twice, 11; ἐγχειρεῖν is also used in § 6. [2] i., § 10.

[3] Mark xvi. 17; 1 Tim. iv. 6; 2 Tim. iii. 10.

[4] *Contra Apion.*, i., §§ 10, 23; ii. 1; κατακολουθεῖν also occurs, § 3, and in Luke xxiii. 55, Acts xvi. 17.

[5] Matt. ii. 8; ἀκριβέστερον is found once, in Acts xviii. 26.

[6] *Contra Apion.*, §§ 3, 10.

[7] The argument from page 600 to this point is extracted from an article by the author which appeared in the *Fortnightly Review*, October 1st, 1877, p. 496 f. An able work has since appeared, *Josephus und Lucas*, by Max Krenkel (Leipzig, 1894), in which the influence of the Jewish historian upon the author of the third Gospel and Acts of the Apostles is exhaustively examined and, we consider, fully established.

nature of the problem regarding the author of the third Synoptic and of the Acts of the Apostles; and whilst for our purpose much less would have sufficed, it is evident that the materials do not exist for identifying him. The stupendous miracles related in these two works, therefore, rest upon the evidence of an unknown writer, who from internal evidence must have composed them very long after the events recorded. Externally, there is no proof even of the existence of the Acts until towards the end of the second century, when also for the first time we hear of a vague theory as to the name and identity of the supposed author—a theory which declares Luke not to have himself been an eye-witness of the occurrences related in the Gospel, and which reduces his participation even in the events narrated in the Acts to a very small and modest compass, leaving the great mass of the miracles described in the work without even his personal attestation. The theory we have seen to be not only unsupported by evidence, but to be contradicted by many potent circumstances. We propose now, without exhaustively examining the contents of the Acts, which would itself require a separate treatise, at least to consider some of its main points sufficiently to form a fair judgment of the historical value of the work, although the facts which we have already ascertained are clearly fatal to the document as adequate testimony for miracles, and the reality of Divine Revelation.

CHAPTER III.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK: DESIGN AND COMPOSITION

The historical value of the Acts of the Apostles has very long been the subject of vehement discussion, and the course of the controversy has certainly not been favourable to the position of the work. For a considerable time the traditional view continued to prevail, and little or no doubt of the absolute credibility of the narrative was ever expressed. When the spirit of independent and enlightened criticism was finally aroused, it had to contend with opinions which habit had rendered stereotype, and prejudices which took the form of hereditary belief. A large body of eminent critics, after an exhaustive investigation of the Acts, have now declared that the work is not historically accurate, and cannot be accepted as a true account of the Acts and teaching of the Apostles.

The author of the Acts has been charged with having written the work with a distinct design to which he subordinated historical truth, and in this view many critics have joined who ultimately do not accuse him absolutely of falsifying history, but merely of making a deliberate selection of his materials with the view of placing events in the light most suitable for his purpose. Most of those who make this charge maintain that, in carrying out the original purpose of the Acts, the writer so freely manipulated whatever materials he had before him, and so dealt with facts whether by omission, transformation, or invention, that the historical value of his narrative has been destroyed or at least seriously affected. On the other hand, many apologetic writers altogether deny the existence of any design on the part of the author such as is here indicated, which could have led him to suppress or distort facts; and whilst some of them advance very varied and fanciful theories as to the historical plan upon which the writer proceeds, and in accordance with which the peculiarities of his narrative are explained, they generally accept the work as the genuine history of the Acts of the Apostles so far as the author possessed certain information. The design most generally ascribed to the writer of the Acts may, with many minor variations, be said to be apologetic and conciliatory: an attempt

to reconcile the two parties in the early Church by representing the difference between the views of Peter and Paul as slight and unimportant, Pauline sentiments being freely placed in the mouth of Peter, and the Apostle of the Gentiles being represented as an orthodox adherent of the Church of Jerusalem, with scarcely such advanced views of Christian universality as Peter; or else, an effort of Gentile Christianity to bring itself into closer union with the primitive Church, surrendering, in so doing, all its distinctive features and its Pauline origin, and representing the universalism by which it existed, as a principle adopted and promulgated from the very first by Peter and the Twelve. It is not necessary for us to enter upon any minute discussion of this point, nor is it requisite, for the purposes of our inquiry, to determine whether the peculiar character of the writing which we are examining is the result of a perfectly definite purpose controlling the whole narrative and modifying every detail, or naturally arises from the fact that it is the work of a pious member of the Church writing long after the events related, and imbuing his materials, whether of legend or ecclesiastical tradition, with his own thoroughly orthodox views: history freely composed for Christian edification. We shall not endeavour to construct any theory to account for the phenomena before us, nor to discover the secret motives or intentions of the writer, but, taking them as they are, we shall simply examine some of the more important portions of the narrative, with a view to determine whether the work can in any serious sense be regarded as credible history.

No one can examine the contents of the Acts without perceiving that some secret motive or influence did certainly govern the writer's mind, and guide him in the selection of topics, and this is betrayed by many peculiarities in his narrative. Quite apart from any attempt to discover precisely what that motive was, it is desirable that we should briefly point out some of these peculiarities. It is evident that every man who writes a history must commence with a distinct plan, and that the choice of subjects to be introduced or omitted must proceed upon a certain principle. This is, of course, an invariable rule wherever there is order and arrangement. No one has ever questioned that in the Acts of the Apostles both order and arrangement have been deliberately adopted, and the question naturally arises, What was the plan of the author? and upon what principle did he select, from the mass of facts which might have been related regarding the Church in the Apostolic ages, precisely those which he has inserted, to the exclusion of the rest? What title will adequately represent the contents of the book? for it is admitted by almost all critics that the actual name which the book bears neither was given to it by its author nor properly describes its intention and

subject.[1] The extreme difficulty which has been felt in answering these questions, and in constructing any hypothesis which may fairly correspond with the actual contents of the Acts, constitutes one of the most striking commentaries on the work, and, although we cannot here detail the extremely varied views of critics upon the subject, they are well worthy of study. No one now advances the theory which was anciently current that the author simply narrated that of which he was an eye-witness.[2] Its present title, *πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων*, would lead us to expect an account of the doings of the Apostles in general, but we have nothing like this in the book. Peter and Paul occupy the principal parts of the narrative, and the other Apostles are scarcely mentioned. James is introduced as an actor in the famous Council, and represented as head of the Church in Jerusalem; but it is much disputed that he was either an Apostle, or one of the Twelve. The death of James the brother of John is just mentioned. John is represented on several occasions during the earlier part of the narrative as the companion of Peter, without being prominently brought forward; and the rest of the Twelve are left in complete obscurity. It is not a history of the labours of Peter and Paul, for not only is considerable importance given to the episodes of Stephen and Philip the Evangelist, but the account of the two great Apostles is singularly fragmentary. After a brief chronicle of the labours of Peter, he suddenly disappears from the scene, and we hear of him no more. Paul then becomes the prominent figure in the drama; but we have already pointed out how defective is the information given regarding him, and he is also abandoned as soon as he is brought to Rome: of his subsequent career and martyrdom nothing whatever is said. The work is not, as Luther suggested, a gloss on the Epistles of Paul and the inculcation of his doctrine of righteousness through faith, for the narrative of the Acts, so far as we can compare it with the Epistles, which are nowhere named in it, is generally in contradiction to them, and the doctrine of justification by faith is conspicuous by its absence. It is not a history of the first Christian missions, for it ignores entirely the labours of most of the Apostles, omits all mention of some of the most interesting missionary journeys, and does not even give a report of the introduction of Christianity into Rome. It is not in any sense a Paulinian history of the Church, for if, on the one side, it describes the Apostles of the Circumcision as promulgating the

[1] Perhaps the perfectly vague designation of the book, "Acts," *Πράξεις*, in the *Cod. Sinaiticus*, may be taken as the closest—because most vague—description of its contents.

[2] Cf. Hieron., *De vir. ill.*, 7; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 4; *Can. Murat*, ed. Tregelles, p. 18 f.

universalism which Paul preached, it robs him of his originality, dwarfs his influence upon the development of Christianity, and is, on the other hand, too defective to represent Church history, whether from a Paulinian or any other standpoint. The favourite theory, that the writer designed to relate the story of the spread of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome, can scarcely be maintained, although it certainly has the advantage of a vagueness of proportions equally suitable to the largest and most limited treatment of history. But, in such a case, we have a drama with the main incident omitted; for the introduction of the Gospel into Rome is not described at all, and, whilst the author could not consider the personal arrival at Rome of the Apostle Paul the climax of his history, he at once closes his account where the final episode ought to have commenced.

From all points of view, and upon any hypothesis, the Acts of the Apostles is so obviously incomplete as a history, so fragmentary and defective as biography, that critics have to the present day failed in framing any theory which could satisfactorily account for its anomalies, and have almost been forced to explain them by supposing a partial, apologetic or conciliatory, design, which removes the work from the region of veritable history. The whole interest of the narrative, of course, centres in the two representative Apostles, Peter and Paul, who alternately fill the scene. It is difficult to say, however, whether the account of the Apostle of the Circumcision or of Paul is the more capriciously partial and incomplete. After his miraculous liberation from the prison into which he had been cast by Herod, the doings of Peter are left unchronicled, and, although he is reintroduced for a moment to plead the cause of the Gentiles at the Council in Jerusalem, he then finally retires from the scene, to give place to Paul. The omissions from the history of Paul are very remarkable, and all the more so from the extreme and unnecessary detail of the itinerary of some of his journeys, and neither the blanks on the one hand, nor the excessive minuteness on the other, are to be explained by any theory connected with personal knowledge on the part of Theophilus. Of the general history of the primitive Church, and the life and labours of the Twelve, we are told little or nothing. According to the author, the propagation of the Gospel was carried on more by angelic agency than apostolic enthusiasm. There is a liberal infusion of miraculous episodes in the story, but a surprising scarcity of facts. Even where the author is best informed, as in the second part of the Acts, the narrative of Paul's labours and missionary journeys, while presenting striking omissions, is really minute and detailed only in regard to points of no practical interest, leaving both the distinctive teaching of the Apostle and the internal economy of the Church almost entirely

unrepresented. Does this defective narrative of the Acts of the Apostles proceed from poverty of information or from the arbitrary selection of materials for a special purpose? As we proceed it will become increasingly evident that, limited although the writer's materials are, the form into which they have been moulded has undoubtedly been determined either by a dominant theory or a deliberate design, neither of which is consistent with the composition of sober history.

This is particularly apparent in the representation which is given of the two principal personages of the narrative. Critics have long clearly recognised that the author of the Acts has carefully arranged his materials so as to present as close a parallelism as possible between the Apostles Peter and Paul. We shall presently see how closely he assimilates their teaching, ascribing the views of Paul to Peter, and putting Petrine sentiments in the mouth of Paul; but here we shall merely refer to points of general history. If Peter has a certain pre-eminence as a distinguished member of the original Apostolic body, the equal claim of Paul to the honours of the Apostolate, whilst never directly advanced, is prominently suggested by the narration, no less than three times, of the circumstances of his conversion and direct call to the office by the glorified Jesus. The first miracle ascribed to Peter is the healing of "a certain man lame from his mother's womb" (τις ἀνὴρ χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ) at the Beautiful gate of the Temple,[1] and the first wonder performed by Paul is also the healing of "a certain man lame from his mother's womb" (τις ἀνὴρ χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ) at Lystra;[2] Ananias and Sapphira are punished through the instrumentality of Peter,[3] and Elymas is smitten with blindness at the word of Paul;[4] the sick are laid in the streets that the shadow of Peter may fall upon them, and they are healed, as are also those vexed with unclean spirits;[5] handkerchiefs or aprons are taken to the sick from the body of Paul, and they are healed, and the evil spirits go out of them;[6] Peter withstands Simon the sorcerer,[7] as Paul does the sorcerer Elymas and the exorcists at Ephesus;[8] if Peter heals the paralytic Æneas at Lydda,[9] Paul restores to health the fever-stricken father of Publius at Melita;[10] Peter raises from the dead Tabitha, a disciple at Joppa,[11] and Paul restores to life the disciple Eutychus at Troas;[12] Cornelius falls at the feet of Peter, and worships him, Peter preventing him, and saying: "Rise up! I myself also am a man";[13] and in like manner the people of Lystra would have done sacrifice to Paul, and he prevents them, crying out: "We also are

[1] iii. 2 f. [2] xiv. 8 f. [3] v. 1 f. [4] xiii. 11 f.
[5] v. 12, 15 f. [6] xix. 11, 12. [7] viii. 20 f. [8] xiii. 11 f., xix. 13 f.
[9] ix. 33 f. [10] xxviii. 8. [11] ix. 36 f. [12] xx. 9 f.
[13] x. 25, 26.

men of like passions with you";[1] Peter lays his hands on the people of Samaria, and they receive the Holy Ghost and the gift of tongues,[2] and Paul does the same for believers at Ephesus;[3] Peter is brought before the council,[4] and so is Paul;[5] the one is imprisoned and twice released by an angel,[6] and the other is delivered from his bonds by a great earthquake;[7] if Peter be scourged by order of the council,[8] Paul is beaten with many stripes at the command of the magistrates of Philippi.[9] It is maintained that the desire to equalise the sufferings of the two Apostles in the cause of the Gospel, as he has equalised their miraculous displays, probably led the author to omit all mention of those perils and persecutions to which the Apostle Paul refers in support of his protest that he had laboured and suffered more than all the rest.[10] If Paul was called by a vision to the ministry of the Gentiles,[11] so Peter is represented as having been equally directed by a vision to baptise the Gentile Cornelius;[12] the double vision of Peter and Cornelius has its parallel in the double vision of Paul and Ananias. It is impossible to deny the measured equality thus preserved between the two Apostles, or to ignore the fact that parallelism like this is the result of premeditation, and cannot claim the character of impartial history.

The speeches form an important element in the Acts of the Apostles, and we shall now briefly examine them, reserving, however, for future consideration their dogmatic aspect. Few if any writers, however apologetic, maintain that these discourses can possibly have been spoken exactly as they are recorded in the Acts. The utmost that is asserted is that they are substantially historical, and fairly represent the original speeches. They were derived, it is alleged, either from written sources or oral tradition, and many, especially in the second part, are supposed to have been delivered in the presence of the author of the work. This view is held, of course, with a greater or less degree of assurance as to the closeness of the relation which our record bears to the original addresses; but, without here very closely scrutinising hesitation or reticence, our statement fairly renders the apologetic position. A large body of able critics deny the historical character of these speeches, and consider them merely free compositions by the author of the Acts, at the best being on a par with the speeches which many ancient writers place in the mouths of their historical personages, and giving only what the writer supposed that the speaker would say under the

[1] xiv. 13 f., cf. xxviii. 6. [2] viii. 14 f., x. 44 f., etc. [3] xix. 1 f.
[4] v. 21 f. [5] xxii. 30, xxiii. 1 f. [6] v. 19, xii. 6 f.
[7] xvi. 26. [8] v. 40. [9] xvi. 22 f.
[10] 2 Cor. xi. 23 f., 1 Cor. xv. 10; Stap, *Études sur les Origines*, etc., p. 124 f.
[11] ix. 6, 15 f. [12] x. 9 f., xi. 1 f., xv. 7.

circumstances. That the writer may have made use of such materials as were within his reach, or endeavoured to embody the ideas which tradition may broadly have preserved, is admitted as possible; but that these discourses can seriously be accepted as conveying a correct report of anything actually spoken by the persons in whose mouths they are put is, of course, denied. It is, obviously, extremely improbable that any of these speeches could have been written down at the time. Taking even the supposed case that the author of the Acts was Luke, and was present when some of the speeches of Paul were delivered, it is difficult to imagine that he immediately recorded his recollection of them, and more than this he could not have done. He must continually have been in the habit of hearing the preaching of Paul, and therefore could not have had the inducement of novelty to make him write down what he heard. The idea of recording them for posterity could not have occurred to such a person, with the belief in the approaching end of all things then prevalent. The author of the Acts was not the companion of Paul, however, and the contents of the speeches, as we shall presently see, are not of a character to make it in the least degree likely that they could have been written down for separate circulation. Many of the speeches in the Acts, moreover, were delivered under circumstances which render it specially unlikely that they could have been reported with any accuracy. At no time an easy task correctly to record a discourse of any length, it is doubly difficult when those speeches, like many in Acts, were spoken under circumstances of great danger or excitement. The experience of modern times, before the application of systems of shorthand, may show how imperfectly speeches were taken down, even where there was deliberate preparation and set purpose to do so; and if it be suggested that some celebrated orations of the last century have so been preserved, it is undeniable that what has been handed down to us is either a mere copy of the previously written speech, or does not represent the original, but is almost a subsequent composition, preserving little more than some faint echoes of the real utterance. The probability that a correct record of speeches made under such circumstances in the middle of the first century could have been kept seems exceedingly small. Even if it could be shown that the author of the Acts took these speeches substantially from earlier documents, it would not materially tend to establish their authenticity; for the question would still remain perfectly open as to the closeness of those documents to the original discourses; but in the absence of all evidence, whether as to the existence or origin of any such records, the conjecture of their possible existence can have no weight. We have nothing but internal testimony to

examine, and that, we shall see, is totally opposed to the claim to historical value made for those discourses.

Apologists scarcely maintain that we have in the Acts a record of the original speeches in their completeness, but in claiming substantial accuracy most of them include the supposition at least of careful condensation. The longest discourse in the Acts would not have taken more than six or seven minutes to deliver, and it is impossible to suppose that what is there given can have been the whole speech delivered on many of the occasions described. For instance, is it probable that King Agrippa, who desires to hear Paul, and who comes "with great pomp" with Berenice to do so, should only have been favoured with a speech lasting five minutes? The author himself tells us that Paul was not always so brief in his addresses as one might suppose from the specimens here presented.[1] It is remarkable, however, that not the slightest intimation is given that the speeches are only substantially reported or are abridged, and their form and character are evidently designed to convey the impression of complete discourses. If the reader examine any of these speeches, it will be clear that they are concise compositions, betraying no marks of abridgment, and having no fragmentary looseness, but, on the contrary, that they are highly artificial and finished productions, with a continuous argument. Many of them are singularly inadequate to produce the impressions described; but at least it is not possible to discover that material omissions have been made, or that their periods were originally expanded by large, or even any, amplification. If these speeches be regarded as complete, and with little or no condensation, another strong element is added to the suspicion as to their authenticity, for such extreme baldness and brevity in the declaration of a new religion, requiring both explanation and argument, cannot be conceived, and in the case of Paul, with whose system of teaching and doctrine we are well acquainted through his Epistles, it is impossible to accept such meagre and one-sided addresses as representations of his manner. The statement that the discourses are abridged, and a mere *résumé* of those originally delivered, rests upon no authority, is a mere conjecture to account for an existing difficulty, and is in contradiction to the actual form of the speeches in Acts. Regarded as complete, their incongruity is intensified; but, considered as abridged, they have lost in the process all representative character and historical fitness.

It has been argued, indeed, that the different speeches bear evidence to their genuineness from their suitability to the speakers, and to the circumstances under which they are said to have been

[1] xx. 7–9.

delivered; but the existence of anything but the most superficial semblance of idiosyncratic character must be denied. The similarity of form, manner, and matter in all the speeches is most remarkable, as will presently be made more apparent, and the whole of the doctrine enunciated amounts to little more than the repetition, in slightly varying words, of the brief exhortation to repentance and belief in Jesus, the Christ, that salvation may be obtained, with references to the ancient history of the Jews, singularly alike in all discourses. Very little artistic skill is necessary to secure a certain suitability of the word to the action and the action to the word; and evidence is certainly reduced to a very low ebb when such agreement as is presented in the Acts is made an argument for authenticity. Not only is the consistency of the sentiments uttered by the principal speakers, as compared with what is known of their opinions and character, utterly disputed, but it must be evident that the literary skill of the author of the Acts was quite equal to so simple a task as preserving at least such superficial fitness as he displays.

It has been freely admitted by critics of all schools that the author's own peculiarities of style and language are apparent in all the speeches of the Acts. We may point out a few general instances of this nature which are worthy of attention. The author introduces the speeches of different persons with the same expression, "he opened his mouth," or something similar. Philip "opened his mouth" (*ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ*)[1] and addressed the Ethiopian (viii. 35). Peter "opened his mouth (and) said" (*ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα, εἶπεν*), when he delivered his discourse before the baptism of Cornelius (x. 34). Again, he uses it of Paul: "And when Paul was about to open his mouth (*μέλλοντος ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα*) Gallio said," etc. (xviii. 14). The words with which the speech of Peter at Pentecost is introduced deserve more attention: "Peter lifted up his voice and said unto them" (*ἐπῆρεν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπεφθέγξατο αὐτοῖς*) (ii. 14). The verb *ἀποφθέγγεσθαι* occurs again (ii. 4) in the account of the descent of the Holy Spirit and the gift of tongues, and it is put into the mouth of Paul (xxvi. 25) in his reply to Festus; but it occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. The favourite formula with which all speeches open is, "Men (and) Brethren" (*ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί*), or *ἄνδρες* coupled with some other term, as "Men (and) Israelites" (*ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται*), or simply *ἄνδρες* without addition. *Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί* occurs no less than thirteen times. It is used thrice by Peter,[2] six times by Paul,[3] as well as

[1] It is to be remarked, however, that the same expression occurs in the first Synoptic (Matt. v. 2, xiii. 35, xvii. 27), and only once in Luke i. 64. It is also quoted Acts viii. 32 from the lxx. version of Isaiah liii. 7.

[2] i. 16; ii. 29; xv. 7. [3] xiii. 26, 38; xxii. 1; xxiii. 1, 6; xxviii. 17.

by Stephen,[1] James,[2] the believers at Pentecost,[3] and the rulers of the Synagogue.[4] The angels at the Ascension address the disciples as "Men (and) Galileans" (*ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι*).[5] Peter makes use of *ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται* twice,[6] and it is likewise employed by Paul,[7] by Gamaliel,[8] and by the Jews of Asia.[9] Peter addresses those assembled at Pentecost as *ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι*.[10] Paul opens his Athenian speech with *ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι*,[11] and the town-clerk begins his short appeal to the craftsmen of Ephesus: *ἄνδρες Ἐφέσιοι*.[12] Stephen begins his speech to the Council with "Men, Brethren, and Fathers, hear" (*ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατε*), and Paul uses the very same words in addressing the multitude from the stairs of the Temple.[13]

In the speech which Peter is represented as making at Pentecost he employs in an altogether peculiar way (ii. 25–27) Psalm xvi., quoting it in order to prove that the Resurrection of Jesus the Messiah was a necessary occurrence, which had been foretold by David. This is principally based upon the tenth verse of the Psalm: "Because thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt thou give thy Holy One (*τὸν ὅσιόν σου*) to see corruption (*διαφθοράν*)."[14] Peter argues that David both died and was buried, and that his sepulchre is with them to that day, but that, being a prophet, he foresaw and spake here of the Resurrection of Christ, "that neither was he left in Hades nor did his flesh see corruption (*διαφθοράν*)."[15] Is it not an extremely singular circumstance that Peter, addressing an audience of Jews in Jerusalem, where he might naturally be expected to make use of the vernacular language, actually quotes the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, and bases his argument upon a mistranslation of the Psalm, which, we may add, was in all probability not composed by David at all? The word translated "Holy One" should be in the plural—"holy ones," that is to say; "thy saints," and the word rendered *διαφθορά* corruption, really signifies "grave" or "pit." The poet, in fact, merely expresses his confidence that he will be preserved alive. The best critics recognise that Psalm xvi. is not a Messianic psalm at all, and many of those who, from the use which is made of it in Acts, are led to assert that it is so, recognise in the main that it can only be applied to the Messiah indirectly, by arguing that the prophecy

[1] vii. 2.
[2] xv. 13.
[3] ii. 37.
[4] xiii. 15.
[5] i. 11.
[6] ii. 22; iii. 12.
[7] xiii. 16.
[8] v. 35.
[9] xxi. 28.
[10] ii. 14.
[11] xvii. 22.
[12] xix. 35.
[13] vii. 2; xxii. 1.
[14] *ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχήν μου εἰς ᾅδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὅσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.* Acts ii. 27.
[15] Acts ii. 31.

was not fulfilled in the case of the poet who speaks of himself, but was fulfilled in the Resurrection of Jesus. This reasoning, however, totally ignores the sense of the original, and is opposed to all legitimate historical interpretation of the Psalm. Not dwelling upon this point at present, we must go on to point out that, a little further on (xiii. 35 37), the Apostle Paul is represented as making use of the very same argument which Peter here employs, and quoting the same passage from Psalm xvi. to support it. This repetition of very peculiar reasoning, coupled with other similarities which we shall presently point out, leads to the inference that it is merely the author himself who puts this argument into their mouths; and this conclusion is strengthened by the circumstance that, throughout both Gospel and Acts, he always quotes from the Septuagint, even when that version departs from the sense of the original. It may be well to give both passages in juxtaposition, in order that the closeness of the analogy may be more easily realised. For this purpose we somewhat alter the order of the verses:—

Peter in Acts ii.	Paul in Acts xiii.
25. For David saith concerning him..... 27. Because thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt thou give thine holy one to see corruption.	35. Wherefore he (David) saith also in another (Psalm): Thou wilt not give thine holy one to see corruption.
30. Being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God swore with an oath to him that of the fruit of his loins[1] he would set one upon his throne,	22. .....he raised up unto them David for king.....
31. He foresaw and spoke of the resurrection of the Christ, that he was neither left in Hades nor did his flesh see corruption (*διαφθορά*).	23. Of this man's seed God, according to promise, brought unto Israel a Saviour Jesus.
29. Men (and) brethren I may speak with freedom unto you of the patriarch David, that he both died and was buried, and his sepulchre is amongst us unto this day.	34. But that he raised him up from the dead no more to return to corruption (*διαφθορά*) he has said on this wise.....
32. This Jesus God raised up.	36. For David, after he served in his own generation the counsel of God, fell asleep, and was added to his fathers and saw corruption (*διαφθορά*);
	37. But he whom God raised saw not corruption (*διαφθοράν*).

Not only is this argument the same in both discourses, but the whole of Paul's speech, xiii. 16 f., is a mere reproduction of the two speeches of Peter, ii. 14 f. and iii. 12 f., with such alterations as the writer could introduce to vary the fundamental sameness of ideas and expressions. It is worth while to show this in a similar way.

[1] The authorised version, with *Cod. D*, and some other MSS., inserts here "according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit," etc.

Paul in Acts xiii.	Peter in Acts ii. and iii.
16. And Paul having risen ..... (ἀναστὰς δὲ II.).....said.....Men (and) Israelites (ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται) and ye that fear God.....	14. And Peter stood up (σταθεὶς δὲ II.)..... and spoke plainly to them ..... Men (and) Jews (ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι) and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem ..... (verse 22 and iii. 12) Men (and) Israelites (ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται).
22 and 23. See above.	30. See above.
24. When John first preached[1] before his coming the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel.	iii. 19. Repent, therefore, and turn ..... 20 .. ..that he may send Christ Jesus who before was appointed[1] for you.
26. Men (and) Brethren (ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί), sons (υἱοὶ) of the race of Abraham and those amongst you who fear God, to you was the word of this salvation sent (ἀπεστάλη).[2]	ii. 29. Men (and) Brethren (ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί).
	iii. 25.[3] Ye are the sons (υἱοί) of the prophets and of the covenant which God made unto your fathers, saying unto Abraham..... 26..... unto you first God, having raised up his servant (τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ),[4] sent (ἀπέστειλεν) him to bless you.
27. For they that dwell in Jerusalem and their rulers (οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν), not knowing (ἀγνοήσαντες) this (man) nor yet the voices of the prophets (τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν), which are read every (πᾶν) sabbath day, fulfilled (ἐπλήρωσαν) them by their judgment of him ;	iii. 17.[5] And now brethren (ἀδελφοί) I know that ye did (it) in ignorance (ἄγνοιαν), as did also your rulers (οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν) ; 18. but the things which God before announced by the mouth of all the prophets (διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν) he thus fulfilled (ἐπλήρωσεν) ;
28. And though having found no cause of death, they desired (ἠτήσαντο) Pilate that he should be slain (ἀναιρεθῆναι) ;[6]	iii. 13. ..... whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate when he decided to release him ; (ii. 23. This (man) delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, by the hand of lawless (men) crucifying (him) ye slew (ἀνείλατε),[6]

[1] The authorised version of iii. 20 reads "preached," adopting the same verb προκηρύττειν as in xiii. 24, which is nowhere else used in the N. T. It is fair to say, however, that the evidence is greatly in favour of the reading "προκεχειρισμένον" in iii. 20.

[2] ἐξαπεστάλη is the reading of A, B, C, D, ℵ, etc. ; the reading given is that of E, G, H, etc.

[3] Cf. ii. 39 : For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, whomsoever the Lord God shall have called unto him.

[4] Rendered "son" in the authorised version.

[5] Cf. Acts xvii. 30.

[6] This verb ἀναιρεῖν is used twice in Luke, only thrice in the rest of the N. T., but nineteen times in Acts, and it is freely put into the mouths of Peter, Paul, Stephen, and Gamaliel, as well as used in the narrative portions.

PAUL IN ACTS XIII.	PETER IN ACTS II. AND III.
	iii. 14. But ye denied the holy and just one, and desired (ἠτήσασθε) a murderer to be granted to you,
29. But when they finished all the things written regarding him, they took him down from the tree and laid him in a sepulchre.	
30. But God raised him from the dead; (ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν).	15. And killed the Prince of life whom God raised from the dead (ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν), whose witnesses (μάρτυρες) we are.
31. .....who are now his witnesses (μάρτυρες).	
32. And we declare unto you the promise made unto the fathers (πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας),	iii. 25. Ye are the sons of the prophets and of the covenant made unto your fathers (πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν) saying.....
33. That God has perfectly fulfilled the same unto our children, having raised up (ἀναστήσας) Jesus, as it is written.....	26. Unto you first God, having raised up (ἀναστήσας) his servant (παῖδα) Jesus, sent him to bless you, etc.
34, 35, 36, 37. See above.	ii. 31, 27, 29, 32. See above.
38. Be it known unto you, therefore, men (and) brethren (ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί), that through this man is proclaimed unto you remission of sins (ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν).	ii. 37. Men (and) Brethren (ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί).
	38. .....Repent and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for remission of your sins (ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν), etc.
39. And from all things from which ye could not be justified in the law of Moses, every one who believes in this man is justified;	iii. 22. Moses indeed said[1]: A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you.
40. Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets;	23. And it shall be that every soul which will not hear that prophet shall be destroyed from among the people.
41. Behold ye despisers, and wonder and perish.	24. And all the prophets also from Samuel and from those that follow after, as many as spake, also foretold these days.

Paul's address likewise bears close analogy with the speech of Stephen, vii. 2 f., commencing with a historical survey of the earlier traditions of the people of Israel, and leading up to the same accusation that, as their fathers disregarded the prophets, so they had persecuted and slain the Christ. The whole treatment of the subject betrays the work of the same mind in both discourses. Bleek, who admits the similarity between these and other speeches in Acts, argues that "it does not absolutely follow from this that these speeches are composed by one and the same

[1] This reference is also put into the mouth of Stephen, Acts vii. 37.

person, and are altogether unhistorical"; for it is natural, he thinks, that in the Apostolical circle, and in the first Christian Church, there should have existed a certain uniform type in the application of messianic passages of the Old Testament, and in quotations generally, to which different teachers might conform without being dependent on each other.[1] He thinks that, along with the close analogy, there is also much which is characteristic in the different speeches. Not only is this typical system of quotation, however, a mere conjecture to explain an actual difficulty, but it is totally inadequate to account for the phenomena. If we suppose, for instance, that Paul had adopted the unhistorical application of the sixteenth Psalm to the Messiah, is it not a very extraordinary thing that in all the arguments in his Epistles he does not once refer to it? Even if this be waived, and it be assumed that he had adopted this interpretation of the Psalm, it will scarcely be asserted that Paul, whose independence and originality of mind are so undeniable, and whose intercourse with the Apostolical circle at any time, and most certainly up to the period when this speech was delivered, was very limited,[2] could so completely have caught the style and copied the manner of Peter that, on an important occasion like this, his address should be a mere reproduction of Peter's two speeches delivered so long before, and when Paul certainly was not present. The similarity of these discourses does not consist in the mere application of the same Psalm, but the whole argument, on each occasion, is repeated with merely sufficient transposition of its various parts to give a superficial appearance of variety. Words and expressions, rare or unknown elsewhere, are found in both, and the characteristic differences which Bleek finds exist only in his own apologetic imagination. Let it be remembered that the form of the speeches and the language are generally ascribed to the author of the Acts. Can any unprejudiced critic deny that the ideas in the speeches we are considering are also substantially the same? Is there any appreciable trace of the originality of Paul in his discourses? There is no ground whatever, apart from the antecedent belief that the various speeches were actually delivered by the men to whom they are ascribed, for asserting that we have here the independent utterances of Peter and Paul. It is internal evidence alone, and no avowal on the part of the author, which leads to the conclusion that the form of the speeches is the author's; and there is no internal evidence which requires us to stop at the mere form, and not equally ascribe the substance to the same source. The speeches in the Acts, generally, have altogether the character of being the composition of one mind

[1] Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 346; Trip, *Paulus*, p. 195. [2] Cf. Gal. i. 11 f., ii. 6.

endeavouring to impart variety of thought and expression to various speakers, but failing signally either from poverty of invention or from the purpose of instituting a close parallel in views, as well as actions, between the two representative Apostles.

Further to illustrate this, let us take another speech of Peter which he delivers on the occasion of the conversion of Cornelius, and it will be apparent that it also contains all the elements, so far as it goes, of Paul's discourse :—

Peter in Acts x.	Paul in Acts xiii.
35. But in every nation he that fears him (*ὁ φοβούμενος*).....is acceptable to him—	26. Sons (*υἱοί*) of the race of Abraham, and those among you who fear God (*οἱ φοβούμενοι*), to you was the word (*ὁ λόγος*) of this salvation sent (*ἀπεστάλη*).[2]
36. The word (*τὸν λόγον*) which he (God) sent (*ἀπέστειλεν*) unto the sons (*υἱοῖς*) of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ ;[1] he is Lord of all.	
37. Ye know the word spoken throughout all Judea, beginning from Galilee, after the baptism (*βάπτισμα*) which John preached,	24. When John first proclaimed before his coming the baptism (*βάπτισμα*) of repentance to all the people of Israel.
38. Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, how God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him.	25. And as John was fulfilling his course, he said : Whom think ye that I am ? I am not he ; but behold there comes one after me the shoes of whose feet I am not worthy to loose.
39. And we are witnesses (*μάρτυρες*) of all things which he did both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem ; whom also they slew (*ἀνεῖλαν*), hanging him upon a tree (*ξύλου*).	27. For they that dwell in Jerusalem and their rulers..... 28. Though having found no cause of death, desired Pilate that he should be slain (*ἀναιρεθῆναι*) ; 29. But when they had finished all the things written regarding him they took him down from the tree (*ξύλου*).
40. Him God raised (*ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν*) the third day, and gave him to become manifest ;	30. But God raised (*ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν*) him from the dead (*ἐκ νεκρῶν*) ;
41. Not to all the people, but to witnesses (*μάρτυσιν*) chosen before by God, even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead (*ἐκ νεκρῶν*).	31. And he appeared for many days to those who came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are now his witnesses (*μάρτυρες*) unto the people.
42. And he commanded (*παρήγγειλεν*) us to preach unto the people and to testify that it is he who has been appointed (*ὁ ὡρισμένος*)[3] by God judge (*κριτὴς*) of quick and dead.	xvii. 30.....but now commands (*παραγγέλλει*) all men everywhere to repent ; 31. Because he fixed a day in the which he is about to judge (*κρίνειν*) the world in righteousness by the man whom he appointed (*ὥρισεν*),[3]

[1] Cf. xiii. 23.

[2] P. 624, note 2.

[3] Except by the author of Luke (xxii. 22) and Acts, the verb *ὁρίζειν* is only twice used in the O. T. In Acts it is twice put into the mouth of Peter (ii. 23, x. 42) and twice into that of Paul (xvii. 26, 31), as well as used in narrative (xi. 29).

Peter in Acts x.	Paul in Acts xiii.
	having given assurance to all by having raised him up from the dead.
43. To him bear all the prophets witness that through his name all who believe in him shall receive remission of sins (ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν).	xiii. 27.....not knowing the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day.....38. Be it known to you, therefore,.....that through this man is proclaimed unto you remission of sins (ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν).

Again, to take an example from another speaker, we find James represented as using an expression which had just before been put into the mouth of Paul, and it is not one in the least degree likely to occur independently to each. The two passages are as follows :—

James in Acts xv. 21.	Paul in Acts xiii. 27.
Moses.....being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day.	.....the prophets being read every Sabbath day.
(κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκόμενος.)	(κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένος.

The fundamental similarity between these different speeches cannot possibly be denied ; and it cannot be reasonably explained in any other way than by the fact that they were composed by the author himself, who had the earlier speeches ascribed to Peter still in his memory when he wrote those of Paul, and who, in short, had not sufficient dramatic power to create altogether distinct characters, but simply made his different personages use his own vocabulary to express his own somewhat limited range of ideas. Setting his special design aside, his inventive faculty only permitted him to represent Peter speaking like Paul, and Paul like Peter.

It is argued by some, however, that in the speeches of Peter, for instance, there are peculiarities of language and expression which show analogy with the first Epistle bearing his name in the New Testament Canon, and, on the other hand, traces of translation in some of them which indicate that these speeches were delivered originally in Aramaic, and that we have only a version of them by the author of the Acts, or by some one from whom he derived them. As regards the first of these suppositions, a few phrases only have been pointed out, but they are of no force under any circumstances, and the whole theory is quite groundless. We do not consider it worth while to enter upon the discussion.[1] There are two potent reasons which render such an argument of no force, even if the supposed analogies were in themselves both numerous and

[1] Those who desire to do so may refer to the complete edition, 1879, vol. iii., p. 22, notes 2, 3, and 4.

striking, which actually they are not. The authenticity of the Epistles bearing the name of Peter is not only not established, but is by very many eminent critics absolutely denied; and there is no certainty that any of the speeches of Peter were delivered in Greek, while the probability is that most, if not all, of that Apostle's genuine discourses must have been spoken in Aramaic. It is, in fact, asserted by apologists that part or all of the speeches ascribed to him in the Acts must have been originally Aramaic, although opinion may differ as to the language in which some of them were spoken. Whether they were delivered in Aramaic, or whether there be uncertainty on the point, any conclusion from linguistic analogies with the Epistles is obviously excluded. One thing is quite undeniable: the supposed analogies are few, and the peculiarities distinguishing the author of Acts in these speeches are extremely numerous and general. Even so thorough an apologist as Tholuck candidly acknowledges that the attempt to prove the authenticity of the speeches from linguistic analogies is hopeless. He says: "Nevertheless, a comparison of the language of the Apostles in their Epistles and in these speeches must in many respects be less admissible than that of the *character* and *historical circumstances*, for indeed, if the language and their peculiarities be compared, it must first be established that all the reported speeches were delivered in the Greek language, which is improbable, and of one of which (xxii. 1, 2) the contrary is expressly stated. Willingly admitting that upon this point difference of opinion is allowable, we express as the view which we have hitherto held that, from ch. xx. onwards, the speeches delivered by Paul are reported more in the language of Luke than in that of Paul."[1] This applies with double force to Peter, whose speeches, there is still greater reason to believe, were delivered in Aramaic, and there is difference of opinion amongst the critics we have referred to even as to whether these speeches were translated by the author of the Acts, or were already before him in a translated form, and were subsequently re-edited by him. We have already shown cause for believing that the whole discussion is groundless, from the fact that the speeches in Acts were simply composed by the author himself, and are not in any sense historical; and this we shall hereafter further illustrate.

It may be worth while to consider briefly the arguments advanced for the theory that some of the speeches show marks of translation. It is asserted that the speech of Peter at Pentecost, ii. 14 f., was delivered in Aramaic. Of course it will be understood that we might be quite prepared to agree to this statement as applied to a speech actually delivered by Peter; but the asser-

[1] *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1839, p. 306.

tion, so far as the speeches in Acts are concerned, is based upon what we believe to be the erroneous supposition that they are genuine reports of discourses. On the contrary, we maintain that these speeches are mere compositions by the author of the work. The contention is, however, that the speech attributed to Peter is the translation of a speech originally delivered in Aramaic. In ii. 24 Peter is represented as saying: "Whom God raised up having loosed the pains of death (λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου), because it is not possible that he should be held (κρατεῖσθαι) by it." It is argued by Bleek and others[1] that, as the context proves, the image intended here was evidently the "snares" or "cords" of death, a meaning which is not rendered by the Greek word ὠδῖνες. The confusion is explained, they contend, when it is supposed that, in his Aramaic speech, Peter made use of a Hebrew expression, equally found in Aramaic, which means as well "snares" or "cords" as "pains" of death. The Greek translator, probably misled by the Septuagint,[2] adopted the latter signification of the Hebrew word in question, and rendered it ὠδῖνες, "pains," which is absolutely inappropriate, for, they argue, it is very unnatural to say of one who had already suffered death, like Christ, that he had been held prisoner by the "*pains*" of death, and loosed from them by the resurrection. There is, however, very little unanimity amongst Apologists about this passage. Ebrard[3] asserts that ὠδῖνες, "pains," is the correct translation of the Hebrew expression, as in Psalm xviii. 5, and that the Hebrew word used always expresses pains of birth, the plural of the similar word for "cord" or "snare" being different. Ebrard, therefore, contends that the Psalm (xviii. 5) does not mean bonds or snares of death, but literally "birth-pains of death," by which the soul is freed from the natural earthly existence as by a second birth to a glorified spiritual life. We need not enter further into the discussion of the passage, but it is obvious that it is mere assumption to assert, on the one hand, that Peter made use of any specific expression, and, on the other, that there was any error of translation on the part of the author of Acts. But agreeing that the Hebrew is erroneously rendered, the only pertinent question is: By whom was the error in question committed? and the reply beyond any doubt is: By the LXX. who translate the Hebrew expression in this very way. It is therefore inadmissible to assert from this phrase the existence of an Aramaic original of the speech, for the phrase itself is nothing but a quotation from the Septuagint.

[1] Bleek, *Einl.*, p. 348; *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1836, p. 1038 f. Cf. Meyer, *Apg.*, p. 72 f.; Neander, *Pflanzung, u. s. w.*, p. 22, anm. 1; Humphrey, Acts, p. 20.

[2] Ps. xvii. 5 (A. V., xviii. 5).

[3] Ebrard, *zu Olshausen, Apg.*, p. 63.

The expression *ὠδῖνες θανάτου* occurs no less than three times in that version: Ps. xvii. 5 (A. V., xviii.), cxiv. 3 (A. V., cxvi.), and 2 Sam. xxii. 6; and in Job xxxii. 2 we have *λύειν* used with *ὠδῖνας*: *ὠδῖνας δὲ αὐτῶν ἔλυσας*. When it is remembered that the author of Acts always quotes the Septuagint version, even when it departs from the sense of the Hebrew original, and in all probability was only acquainted with the Old Testament through it, nothing is more natural than the use of this expression taken from that version; but, with the error already existing there, to ascribe it afresh and independently to the author of Acts, upon no other grounds than the assumption that Peter may have spoken in Aramaic and used an expression which the author misunderstood or wrongly rendered, is not permissible. Indeed, we have already pointed out that, in this very speech, there are quotations of the Old Testament according to the LXX. put into the mouth of Peter, in which that version does not accurately render the original.[1]

The next trace of translation advanced by Bleek[2] is found in ii. 33,[3] where Peter speaks of Christ as exalted: "*τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ*." There can be no doubt, Bleek argues, that there is here a reference to Psalm cx. 1, and that the apostle intends to speak of Christ's elevation "*to* the right (hand) of God"; whereas the Greek expression rather conveys the interpretation, "*by* the right (hand) of God." This expression certainly comes, he asserts, from a not altogether suitable translation of the Hebrew. To this, on the other hand, much may be objected. Winer,[4] followed by others, defends the construction, and affirms that the passage may, without hesitation, be translated, "*to* the right (hand) of God."[5] In which case there is no error at all, and the argument falls to the ground. If it be taken, however, either that the rendering should be, or was intended to be, "by the right (hand) of God"[6]—*i.e.*, by the power of God—that would not involve the necessity of admitting an Aramaic original,[7] because there is no error at all,

[1] Acts ii. 16 f., 26, 27.

[2] *Einl. N. T.*, p. 348; *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1836, p. 1038; De Wette, *Apg.*, p. 42; Weiss, *Petr. Lehrb.*, p. 205.

[3] Cf. Acts v. 31.

[4] *Grammat. N. T. Sprachid.*, 1867, § 31, 5, p. 201.

[5] Winer, *l. c.*; Fritzsche, *Conject.*, i., p. 42; Hackett, *Acts*, p. 51; Kähler, *Stud. u. Kr.*, 1873, p. 511 f.; Lekebusch, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 405; Olshausen, *Apg.*, p. 66; Wordsworth, *Greek Test.*, *Acts*, p. 49.

[6] Alford, *Greek Test.*, ii., p. 26; Bengel, *Gnom. N. T.*, p. 511; Lechler, *Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit.*, p. 21, anm. 1; Zeller, *Apg.*, p. 502, anm. 2; Meyer, *Apg.*, p. 77 f.; Overbeck, *zu de W. Apg.*, p. 42. "By" is adopted by the Vulgate, Syriac, Arabic, and English (authorised) versions.

[7] Alford, *Greek Test.*, ii., p. 26; Lekebusch, *Apg.*, p. 405; Meyer, *Apg.*, p. 77 f.; Overbeck, *zu de W. Apg.*, p. 42; Zeller, *Apg.*, p. 502 f., anm. 2; cf. Kähler, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1873, p. 511 f.

and the argument simply is that, being exalted by the right hand of God, Jesus had poured forth the Holy Spirit; and in the next verse the passage in Psalm cx. 1 (Sept. cix.) is accurately quoted from the Septuagint version: "Sit thou on my right (hand)" (ἐκ δεξιῶν μου). In fact, after giving an account of the crucifixion, death, and resurrection of Jesus, the speaker ascribes his subsequent exaltation to the power of God.[1]

We have seen that at least the form of the speeches in Acts is undoubtedly due to the author of the book, and that he has not been able to make the speeches of the different personages in his drama differ materially from each other. We shall hereafter have occasion to examine further the contents of some of these speeches, and the circumstances under which it is alleged that they were spoken, and to inquire whether these do not confirm the conclusion hitherto arrived at, that they are not historical, but merely the free composition of the author of Acts, and never delivered at all. Before passing on, however, it may be well to glance for a moment at one of these speeches, to which we may not have another opportunity of referring, in order that we may see whether it presents any traces of inauthenticity and of merely ideal composition.

In the first chapter an account is given of a meeting of the brethren in order to elect a successor to the traitor Judas. Peter addresses the assembly, i. 16 f., and it may be well to quote the opening portion of his speech: 16. "Men (and) brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, who became guide to them that took Jesus, 17. because he was numbered with us and obtained the lot of this ministry. 18. Now (μὲν οὖν) this man purchased a field with the wages of the iniquity (ἐκ μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας), and falling headlong he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out; 19. and (καὶ) it became known[2] unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem, so that that field was called in their own tongue (τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ) Acheldamach, that is: field of blood. 20. For (γὰρ) it is written in the book of Psalms: 'Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein,' and 'his office let another take,'" etc. Now, let it be remembered that Peter is supposed to be addressing an audience of Jews in Jerusalem, in the Hebrew or

[1] The expression τῇ δεξιᾷ is used in this sense in the Septuagint version of Isaiah lxiii. 12; cf. Acts v. 31. The "right hand of God," as symbolising his power, is constantly employed in the Old Testament.

[2] The peculiar and favourite expression, γνωστὸν ἐγένετο (or ἔστω) ὑμῖν, which only occurs in Acts, is placed in the mouth of Peter, Paul, and others, and itself betrays the hand of the author. Cf. ii. 14, iv. 10, ix. 42, xiii. 38, xix. 17, xxviii. 22, 28.

Aramaic language, a few weeks after the crucifixion. Is it possible, therefore, that he should give such an account as that in verses 18, 19, of the end of Judas, which he himself, indeed, says was known to all the dwellers at Jerusalem? Is it possible that, speaking in Aramaic to Jews, probably in most part living at and near Jerusalem, he could have spoken of the field being so called by the people of Jerusalem "in their own tongue"? Is it possible that he should, to such an audience, have translated the word Acheldamach? The answer of most unprejudiced critics is that Peter could not have done so. As de Wette remarks: "In the composition of this speech the author has not considered historical decorum."[1] This is felt by most Apologists, and many ingenious theories are advanced to explain away the difficulty. Some affirm that verses 18 and 19 are inserted as a parenthesis by the author of the Acts, whilst a larger number contend that only v. 19 is parenthetic. A very cursory examination of the passage, however, is sufficient to show that the verses cannot be separated. Verse 18 is connected with the preceding by the μὲν οὖν, 19 with 18 by καὶ, and verse 20 refers to 16, as indeed it also does to 17 and 18, without which the passage from the Psalm, as applied to Judas, would be unintelligible. Most critics, therefore, are agreed that none of the verses can be considered parenthetic. Some Apologists, who feel that neither of the obnoxious verses can be thus explained, endeavour to overcome the difficulty by asserting that the words, "in their own tongue" (τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ) and "that is, the field of blood" (τοῦτ' ἔστιν χωρίον αἵματος), in verse 19, are merely explanatory and inserted by the author of Acts. It is unnecessary to say that this explanation is purely arbitrary, and that there is no ground, except the difficulty itself, upon which their exclusion from the speech can be based.

In the cases to which we have hitherto referred, the impossibility of supposing that Peter could have spoken in this way has led writers to lay the responsibility of unacknowledged interpolations in the speech upon the author of Acts, thus at once relieving the Apostle. There are some Apologists who do not adopt this expedient, but attempt to meet the difficulty in other ways, while accepting the whole as a speech of Peter. According to one theory, those who object that Peter could not have thus related the death of Judas to people who must already have been well acquainted with the circumstances have totally overlooked the fact that a peculiar view of what has occurred is taken in the narrative, and that this peculiar view is the principal point of it. According to the statement made, Judas met his miserable end in the very

[1] *Apostelg.*, p. 12.

field which he had bought with the price of blood. It is this circumstance, it appears, which Peter brings prominently forward, and represents as a manifest and tangible dispensation of Divine justice. Unfortunately this is clearly an imaginary moral attached to the narrative by the Apologist, and is not the object of the supposed speaker, who rather desires to justify the forced application to Judas of the quotations in verse 20, which are directly connected with the preceding by γὰρ. Moreover, no explanation is here offered of the extraordinary expressions in verse 19 addressed to citizens of Jerusalem by a Jew in their own tongue.

Another explanation, which includes these points, is still more striking. With regard to the improbability of Peter's relating, in such a way, the death of Judas, it is argued that, according to the Evangelists, the disciples went from Jerusalem back to Galilee some eight days after the resurrection, and only returned before Pentecost to await the fulfilment of the promise of Jesus. Peter and his companions, it is supposed, only after their return became acquainted with the fate of Judas, which had taken place during their absence, and the matter was, therefore, quite new to them; besides, it is added, a speaker is often obliged on account of some connection with his subject to relate facts already known. It is true that some of the Evangelists represent this return to Galilee[1] as having taken place, but the author of the third Gospel and the Acts not only does not do so, but excludes it.[2] In the third Gospel (xxiv. 49) Jesus commands the disciples to remain in Jerusalem until they are endued with power from on high, and then, after blessing them, he is parted from them, and they return from Bethany to Jerusalem.[3] In Acts the author again takes up the theme, and, whilst evidently giving later traditions regarding the appearances after the resurrection, he adheres to his version of the story regarding the command to stay in Jerusalem. In i. 4 he says: "And being assembled together

[1] Matt. xxviii. 10, 16; Mark xvi. 7; John xxi. 1. Dr. Farrar, somewhat pertinently, asks: "Why did they (the disciples) not go to Galilee immediately on receiving our Lord's message? The circumstance is unexplained..... Perhaps the *entire* message of Jesus to them is not recorded; perhaps they awaited the end of the feast" (*Life of Christ*, ii., p. 441, note 1).

[2] In Luke xxiv. 49 the *Cod. Alex.* reads ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἱερουσαλήμ, with *Cod. C* * *, F, H, K, M, and a number of others of less note. The other older *Codices* omit Ἱερουσαλήμ, but there is no difference of opinion that the "city" is Jerusalem.

[3] We shall hereafter have to go more fully into this, and shall not discuss it here. The third Gospel really represents the Ascension as taking place on the day of the Resurrection; and Acts, whilst giving later tradition, and making the Ascension occur forty days after, does not amend, but confirms, the previously enunciated view that the disciples had been ordered to stay in Jerusalem.

with them he commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father," etc.; and here again, verse 12, the disciples are represented, just before Peter's speech is supposed to have been delivered, as returning from the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem. The author of Acts and the third Synoptic, therefore, gives no countenance to this theory.

Setting all this aside, the apologetic hypothesis we are discussing is quite excluded upon other grounds. If we suppose that the disciples did go into Galilee for a time, we find them again in Jerusalem at the election of the successor to Judas, and there is no reason to believe that they had only just returned. The Acts not only allow of no interval at all for the journey to Galilee between i. 12-14 and 15 f., but by the simple statement with which our episode commences, verse 15, "And in these days" (*καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις*), Peter conveys anything but the impression of a very recent return to Jerusalem. If the Apostles had been even a few days there, the incongruity of the speech would remain undiminished; for the 120 brethren who are said to have been present must chiefly have been residents in Jerusalem, and cannot be supposed also to have been absent; and, in any case, events which are represented as so well known to all the dwellers in Jerusalem must certainly have been familiar to the small Christian community whose interest in the matter was so specially great. Moreover, according to the first Synoptic, as soon as Judas sees that Jesus is condemned, he brings the money back to the chief priests, casts it down, and goes and hangs himself, xxvii. 3 f. This is related even before the final condemnation of Jesus and before his crucifixion, and the reader is led to believe that Judas at once put an end to himself, so that the disciples, who are represented as being still in Jerusalem for at least eight days after the resurrection, must have been there at the time.

With regard to the singular expressions in verse 19, this theory goes on to suppose that, out of consideration for Greek fellow believers, Peter had probably already begun to speak in the Greek tongue; and when he designates the language of the dwellers in Jerusalem as "their own dialect," he does not thereby mean Hebrew in itself, but their own expression, the peculiar confession of the opposite party, which admitted the cruel treachery towards Jesus, in that they named the piece of ground Hakel Damah. Here, again, what assumptions! It is generally recognised that Peter must have spoken in Aramaic, and, even if he did not, *τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ*[1] cannot mean anything but the language of "all the dwellers at Jerusalem." In a speech

[1] *διάλεκτος* is used six times in Acts, and nowhere else in the New Testament; *τῃ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ* occurs thrice, i. 19, ii. 6, 8; and *τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ* thrice, xxi. 40, xxii. 2, xxvi. 14.

delivered at Jerusalem, in any language, to an audience consisting at least in considerable part of inhabitants of the place, and certainly almost entirely of persons whose native tongue was Aramaic, to tell them that the inhabitants called a certain field "in their own tongue" Acheldamach, giving them at the same time a translation of the word, is inconceivable to most critics, even including Apologists.

There is another point which indicates not only that this theory is inadequate to solve the difficulty, but that the speech could not have been delivered by Peter a few weeks after the occurrences related. It is stated that the circumstances narrated were so well known to the inhabitants of Jerusalem that the field was called in their own tongue Acheldamach. The origin of this name is not ascribed to the priests or rulers, but to the people, and it is not to be supposed that a popular name could have become attached to this field, and so generally adopted as the text represents, within the very short time which could have elapsed between the death of Judas and the delivery of this speech. Be it remembered that from the time of the crucifixion to Pentecost the interval was in all only about seven weeks, and that this speech was made some time before Pentecost how long we cannot tell, but in any case the interval was much too brief to permit of the popular adoption of the name. The whole passage has much more the character of a narrative of events which had occurred a long time past than of circumstances which had taken place a few days before.

The obvious conclusion is that this speech was never spoken by Peter, but is a much later composition put into his mouth, and written for Greek readers, who required to be told about Judas, and for whose benefit the Hebrew name of the field, inserted for local colouring, had to be translated. This is confirmed by several circumstances, to which we may refer. We shall not dwell much upon the fact that Peter is represented as applying to Judas two passages quoted from the Septuagint version of Psalm lxix. 25 (Sept. lxviii.) and Psalm cix. (Sept. cviii.) which, historically, cannot for a moment be sustained as referring to him. The first of these Psalms is quoted freely, and, moreover, the denunciations in the original being against a plurality of enemies, it can only be made applicable to Judas by altering the plural "their" (αὐτῶν) to "his habitation" (ἔπαυλις αὐτοῦ), a considerable liberty to take with prophecy. The Holy Spirit is said to have spoken this prophecy "concerning Judas" "by the mouth of David," but modern research has led critics to the conclusion that neither Psalm lxix. nor Psalm cix. was composed by David at all. As we know nothing of Peter's usual system of exegesis, very little weight as evidence can be attached

to this. On the other hand, it is clear that a considerable time must have elapsed before these two passages from the Psalms could have become applied to the death of Judas.

The account which is given of the fate of Judas is contradictory to that given in the first Synoptic, and cannot be reconciled with it, but follows a different tradition. According to the first Synoptic (xxvii. 3 f.), Judas brings back the thirty pieces of silver, casts them down in the Temple, and then goes and hangs himself. The chief priests take the money and buy with it the Potter's field, which is not said to have had any other connection with Judas, as a place for the burial of strangers. In the Acts, Judas himself buys a field as a private possession, and, instead of committing suicide by hanging, he is represented as dying from a fall in this field, which is evidently regarded as a special judgment upon him for his crime. Beyond calling attention to this amongst other phenomena presented in this speech, however, we have not further to do with the point at present. We have already devoted too much space to Peter's first address, and we now pass on to more important topics.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY

We now enter upon a portion of our examination of the Acts which is so full of interest in itself that peculiar care will be requisite to restrain ourselves within necessary limits. Hitherto our attention has been mainly confined to the internal phenomena presented by the document before us, with comparatively little aid from external testimony, and, although the results of such criticism have been of no equivocal character, the historical veracity of the Acts has not yet been tested by direct comparison with other sources of information. We now propose to examine, as briefly as may be, some of the historical statements in themselves by the light of information derived from contemporary witnesses of unimpeachable authority, and to confront them with well-established facts in the annals of the first two centuries. This leads us to the borders not only of one of the greatest controversies which has occupied theological criticism, but also of still more important questions regarding the original character and systematic development of Christianity itself. The latter we must here resolutely pass almost unnoticed, and into the former we shall only enter so far as is absolutely necessary to the special object of our inquiry.

The document before us professes to give a narrative of the progress of the primitive Church from its first formation in the midst of Mosaism, with strong Judaistic rules and prejudices, up to that liberal universalism which freely admitted the Christian Gentile, upon equal terms, into communion with the Christian Jew. The question with which we are concerned is strictly this: Is the account in the Acts of the Apostles of the successive steps by which Christianity emerged from Judaism, and, shaking off the restrictions and obligations of the Mosaic law, admitted the Gentiles to a full participation of its privileges, historically true? Is the representation which is made of the conduct and teaching of the older Apostles on the one hand, and of Paul on the other, and of their mutual relations, an accurate one? Can the Acts of the Apostles, in short, be considered a sober and veracious history of so important and interesting an epoch of the Christian Church? This has been vehemently disputed or denied, and the discussion, extending on

every side into important collateral issues, forms in itself a literature of voluminous extent and profound interest. Our path now lies through this debatable land; but, although the controversy as to the connection of Paul with the development of Christianity and his relation to the Apostles of the Circumcision cannot be altogether avoided, it only partially concerns us. We are freed from the necessity of advancing any particular theory, and have here no further interest in it than to inquire whether the narrative of the Acts is historical or not. If, therefore, avoiding many important but unnecessary questions, and restricting ourselves to a straight course across the great controversy, we seem to deal insufficiently with the general subject, it must be remembered that the argument is merely incidental to our inquiry, and that we not only do not pretend to exhaust it, but distinctly endeavour to reduce our share in it to the smallest limits compatible with our immediate object.

According to the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, the Apostolic age presents a most edifying example of concord and moderation. The emancipation of the Church from Mosaic restrictions was effected without strife or heart-burning, and the freedom of the Gospel, if not attained without hesitation, was finally proclaimed with singular largeness of mind and philosophic liberality. The teaching of Paul differed in nothing from that of the elder Apostles. The Christian universalism, which so many suppose to have specially characterised the great Apostle of the Gentiles, was not only shared, but even anticipated, by the elder Apostles. So far from opposing the free admission of the Gentiles to the Christian community, Peter declares himself to have been chosen of God that by his voice they should hear the Gospel,[1] proclaims that there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile,[2] and advocates the abrogation, in their case at least, of the Mosaic law.[3] James, whatever his private predilections may be, exhibits almost equal forbearance and desire of conciliation. In fact, whatever anomalies and contradictions may be discoverable, upon close examination, beneath this smooth and brilliant surface, the picture superficially presented is one of singular harmony and peace. On the other hand, instead of that sensitive independence and self-reliance of character which has been ascribed to the Apostle Paul, we find him represented in the Acts as submissive to the authority of the "Pillars" of the Church, ready to conform to their counsels and bow to their decrees, and as seizing every opportunity of visiting Jerusalem and coming in contact with that stronghold of Judaism. Instead of the Apostle of the Gentiles, preaching the abrogation of the law, and more

[1] Acts xv. 7. [2] *Ib.*, xv. 9. [3] *Ib.*, xv. 10.

than suspected of leading the Jews to apostatise from Moses,[1] we find a man even scrupulous in his observance of Mosaic customs, taking vows upon him, circumcising Timothy with his own hand, and declaring at the close of his career, when a prisoner at Rome, that he "did nothing against the people or the customs of the fathers."[2] There is no trace of angry controversy, of jealous susceptibility, of dogmatic difference, in the circle of the Apostles. The intercourse of Paul with the leaders of the Judaistic party is of the most unbroken pleasantness and amity. Of opposition to his ministry, or doubt of his Apostleship, whether on the part of the Three or of those who identified themselves with their teaching, we have no hint. We must endeavour to ascertain whether this is a true representation of the early development of the Church, and of the momentous history of the Apostolic age.

In the Epistles of Paul we have, at least to some extent, the means of testing the accuracy of the statements of the Acts with regard to him and the early history of the Church. The Epistles to the Galatians, to the Corinthians (2), and to the Romans are generally admitted to be genuine,[3] and can be freely used for this purpose. To these we shall limit our attention, excluding other epistles, whose authenticity is either questioned or denied; but in doing so no material capable of really affecting the result is set aside. For the same reason, we must reject any evidence to be derived from the so-called Epistles of Peter and James, at least so far as they are supposed to represent the opinions of Peter and James; but here again it will be found that they do not materially affect the points immediately before us. The veracity of the Acts of the Apostles being the very point which is in question, it is unnecessary to say that we have to subject the narrative to examination, and by no means to assume the correctness of any statements we find in it. At the same time it must be our endeavour to collect from this document such indications -and they will frequently be valuable -of the true history of the occurrences related, as may be presented between the lines of the text. In the absence of fuller information, it must not be forgotten that human nature in the first century of our era was very much what it is in the nineteenth, and, certain facts being clearly established, it will not be difficult to infer many details which cannot now be positively demonstrated. The Epistle to the Galatians, however, will be our most invaluable guide. Dealing, as it does, with some of the principal episodes of the Acts, we are enabled by the words of the Apostle Paul himself, which have all the accent of truth and vehement earnestness, to control the narrative of the unknown writer of that work; and, where this source fails,

[1] Acts xxi. 21. [2] *Ib.*, xxviii. 17. [3] In great part, at least.

we have the unsuspected testimony of his other Epistles, and of later ecclesiastical history, to assist our inquiry.

The problem, then, which we have to consider is the manner in which the primitive Church emerged from its earliest form, as a Jewish institution with Mosaic restrictions and Israelitish exclusiveness, and finally opened wide its doors to the uncircumcised Gentile, and assumed the character of a universal religion. In order to understand the nature of the case, and be able to estimate aright the solution which is presented by the narrative in the Acts of the Apostles, it is necessary that we should obtain a clear view of the actual characteristics of Christianity at the period when that history begins. We must endeavour to understand precisely what view the Apostles had formed of their position in regard to Judaism, and of the duty which devolved upon them of propagating the Gospel. It is obvious that we cannot rightly appreciate the amount of persuasion requisite to transform the primitive Church from Jewish exclusiveness to Christian universality, without ascertaining the probable amount of long-rooted conviction and religious prejudice or principle which had to be overcome before that great change could be effected.

We shall not here enter upon any argument as to the precise views which the Founder of Christianity may have held as to his own person and work, nor shall we attempt to sift the traditions of his life and teaching which have been handed down to us, and to separate the genuine spiritual nucleus from the grosser matter by which it has been enveloped and obscured. We have much more to do with the view which others took of the matter, and, looking at the Gospels as representations of that which was accepted as the orthodox view regarding the teaching of Jesus, they are almost as useful for our present purpose as if they had been more spiritual and less popular expositions of his views. What the Master was understood to teach is more important for the history of the first century than what he actually taught without being understood.

Nothing is more certain than the fact that Christianity, originally, was developed out of Judaism, and that its advent was historically prepared by the course of the Mosaic system, to which it was so closely related. In its first stages, during the apostolic age, it had no higher ambition than to be, and to be considered, the continuation and the fulfilment of Judaism, its final and triumphant phase. The substantial identity of primitive Christianity with true Judaism was, at first, never called in question; it was considered a mere internal movement of Judaism, its development and completion, but by no means its mutilation. The idea of Christianity as a new religion never entered the minds of the Twelve or of the first believers, nor, as we shall presently see, was it so regarded by the Jews themselves. It was, in fact,

originally nothing more than a sect of Judaism holding a particular view of one point in the creed, and, for a very long period, it was considered so by others, and was in no way distinguished from the rest of Mosaism. Even in the Acts there are traces of this, Paul being called "a ringleader of the sect (αἵρεσις) of the Nazarenes,"[1] and the Jews of Rome being represented as referring to Christianity by this term.[2] Paul, before the Council, not only does not scruple to call himself "a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee," but the Pharisees take part with him against the more unorthodox and hated sect of the Sadducees.[3]

For eighteen centuries disputes have fiercely raged over the creed of Christendom, and the ingenuity of countless divines has been exhausted in deducing mystic dogmas from the primitive teaching; but if there be one thing more remarkable than another in that teaching, according to the Synoptics, it is its perfect simplicity. Jesus did not appear with a ready-made theology, and imposed no elaborate system of doctrine upon his disciples. Throughout the prophetic period of Mosaism one hope had sustained the people of Israel in all their sufferings and reverses—that the fortunes of the nation should finally be retrieved by a scion of the race of David, under whose rule it should be restored to a future of unexampled splendour and prosperity. The expectation of the Messiah, under frequently modified aspects, had formed a living part in the national faith of Israel. Primitive Christianity, sharing, but recasting, this ancient hope, was only distinguished from Judaism, with whose worship it continued in all points united, by a single doctrine, which was in itself merely a modification of the national idea—the belief that Jesus of Nazareth was actually the Christ, the promised Messiah. This was substantially the whole of its creed.

The Synoptic Gospels, and more especially the first,[4] are clearly a history of Jesus as the Messiah of the house of David, so long announced and expected, and whose life and even his death and resurrection are shown to be the fulfilment of a series of Old Testament prophecies. When his birth is announced to Mary, he is described as the great one, who is to sit on the throne of David his father, and reign over the house of Jacob for ever,[5] and the good tidings of great joy to all the people (παντὶ τῷ λαῷ), that the Messiah is born that day in the city of David, are proclaimed by the angel to the shepherds of the plain.[6] Symeon takes the child in his arms and blesses God that the words of the Holy

[1] Acts xxiv. 5. [2] *Ib.*, xxviii. 22. [3] *Ib.*, xxiii. 6 f.

[4] The Gospel commences with the announcement, i. 1, 17, 18; cf. Mark i. 1 f.

[5] Luke i. 32, 33. [6] *Ib.*, ii. 10 f.

Spirit are accomplished, that he should not die before he had seen the Lord's anointed, the Messiah, the consolation of Israel.[1] The Magi come to his cradle in Bethlehem, the birthplace of the Messiah indicated by the prophet,[2] to do homage to him who is born King of the Jews,[3] and there Herod seeks to destroy him,[4] fulfilling another prophecy.[5] His flight into Egypt and return to Nazareth are equally the fulfilment of prophecies.[6] John the Baptist, whose own birth as the forerunner of the Messiah had been foretold,[7] goes before him preparing the way of the Lord, and announcing that the Messianic kingdom is at hand. According to the fourth Gospel, some of the twelve had been disciples of the Baptist, and follow Jesus on their master's assurance that he is the Messiah. One of these, Andrew, induces his brother Simon Peter also to go after him by the announcement: "We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ" (i. 35 f. 41). And Philip tells Nathaniel: "We have found him of whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets did write: Jesus, the Son of Joseph, who is from Nazareth" (i. 45). When he has commenced his own public ministry, Jesus is represented as asking his disciples, "Who do men say that I am?" and, setting aside the popular conjectures that he is John the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets, by the still more direct question, "And who do ye say that I am? Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." And in consequence of this recognition of his Messiahship, Jesus rejoins: "And I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church."[8]

It is quite apart from our present object to point out the singular feats of exegesis and perversions of historical sense by which passages of the Old Testament are forced to show that every event in the history, and even the startling novelty of a suffering and crucified Messiah, which to Jews was a stumbling-block and to Gentiles folly,[9] had been foretold by the prophets. From first to last the Gospels strive to prove that Jesus was the Messiah, and connect him indissolubly with the Old Testament. The Messianic keynote, which is struck at the outset, regulates the strain to the close. The disciples on the way to Emmaus, appalled by the ignominious death of their Master, sadly confide to the stranger their vanished hope that Jesus of Nazareth, whom they now merely call "a prophet mighty in word and deed before

[1] Luke ii. 25-28; so also Elizabeth, ii. 38.
[2] Matt. ii. 5, 6; cf. Micah v. 2.
[3] Matt. ii. 2.
[4] *Ib.*, ii. 16 f.
[5] *Ib.*, ii. 17 f.
[6] *Ib.*, ii. 23.
[7] Luke i. 17 (cf. Matt. xi. 14, xvii. 12 f.; Mark ix. 11 f.), ii. 67 f.; Matt. iii. 3; Mark i. 1 f.
[8] Matt. xvi. 13–18; cf. Mark viii. 29; Luke ix. 20.
[9] 1 Cor. i. 23.

God and all the people," was the Christ "who was about to redeem Israel," and Jesus himself replies: "O foolish and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets spake! Was it not needful that the Christ (Messiah) should suffer these things and enter into his glory? And, beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself."[1] Then, again, when he appears to the eleven immediately after, at Jerusalem, he says: "'These are the words that I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and the prophets and the Psalms concerning me.' Then opened he their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them: 'Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and rise from the dead the third day.'"[2]

The crucifixion and death of Jesus introduced the first elements of rupture with Judaism, to which they formed the great stumbling-block. The conception of a suffering and despised Messiah could naturally never have occurred to a Jewish mind.[3] The first effort of Christianity, therefore, was to repair the apparent breach by proving that the suffering Messiah had actually been foretold by the prophets; and to re-establish the Messianic character of Jesus, by the evidence of his resurrection. But, above all, the momentary deviation from orthodox Jewish ideas regarding the Messiah was retraced by the representation of a speedy second advent, in glory, of the once rejected Messiah to restore the kingdom of Israel, by which the ancient hopes of the people became reconciled with the new expectation of Christians. Even before the ascension the disciples are represented in the Acts as asking the risen Jesus: "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?"[4] There can be no doubt of the reality and universality of the belief, in the Apostolic Church, in the immediate return of the glorified Messiah, and speedy "end of all things."

The substance of the preaching of the Apostles in Acts simply is that Jesus is the Christ,[5] the expected Messiah. Their chief

[1] Luke xxiv. 15–17. [2] *Ib.*, xxiv. 44–46.

[3] In the Gospels the disciples are represented as not understanding such a representation, and Peter, immediately after the famous declaration, "Thou art the Christ," rebukes Jesus for such an idea (Matt. xvi. 21 f.; cf. Mark ix. 32; Luke ix. 45, xviii. 34, etc.).

[4] Acts i. 6. Hase pertinently observes: "The Apostolic Church, both before and after the destruction of Jerusalem, devoutly expected from day to day the return of Christ. If an interval of thousands of years (Jahrtausenden) occur between both events, then there is either an error in the prophecy or in the tradition" (*Das Leben Jesu, 5te Aufl.*, p. 226).

[5] Cf. Acts ix. 22, ii. 36, v. 42, viii. 4 f., 35, x. 36 f., xiii. 23 f., xvii. 3, xviii. 5, 28, xxvi. 22 f. Hegesippus says of James that he was a witness both to Jews and Greeks that Jesus is the Christ (*Euseb., H. E.*, ii. 25).

aim is to prove that his sufferings and death had been foretold by the prophets,[1] and that his resurrection establishes his claim to the title.[2] The simplicity of the creed is illustrated by the rapidity with which converts are made. After a few words, on one occasion three thousand,[3] and on another five thousand,[4] are at once converted. No lengthened instruction or preparation was requisite for admission into the Church. As soon as a Jew acknowledged Jesus to be the Messiah he thereby became a Christian. As soon as the three thousand converts at Pentecost made this confession of faith they were baptised.[5] The Ethiopian is converted whilst passing in his chariot, and is immediately baptised,[6] as are likewise Cornelius and his household after a short address from Peter.[7] The new faith involved no abandonment of the old. On the contrary, the advent of the Messiah was so essential a part of Judaic belief, and the Messianic claim of Jesus was so completely based by the Apostles on the fulfilment of prophecy—"showing by the Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ" —that recognition of the fact rather constituted firmer adhesion to Mosaism, and deeper faith in the inviolable truth of the Covenant with Israel. If there had been no Mosaism, so to say, there could have been no Messiah. So far from being opposed either to the form or spirit of the religion of Israel, the proclamation of the Messiah was its necessary complement, and could only be intelligible by confirmation of its truth and maintenance of its validity. Christianity—belief in the Messiah—in its early phases, drew its whole nourishment from roots that sank deeply into Mosaism. It was indeed nothing more than Mosaism in a developed form. The only difference between the Jew and the Christian was that the latter believed the Messiah to have already appeared in Jesus, whilst the former still expected him in the future; though even this difference was singularly diminished, in appearance at least, by the Christian expectation of the second advent.

It is exceedingly important to ascertain, under these circumstances, what was the impression of the Apostles as to the relation of believers to Judaism and to Mosaic observances, although it must be clear to anyone who impartially considers the origin and historical antecedents of the Christian faith that very little doubt can have existed in their minds on the subject. The teaching of Jesus, as recorded in the synoptic Gospels, is by no means of a doubtful character, more especially when the sanctity of the Mosaic system in the eyes of a Jew is borne in mind. It must be apparent that, in order to remove the obligation of a Law and form

[1] Acts ii. 23 f., iii. 13 f., xxvi. 22 f.
[2] Acts ii. 31, iii. 26, iv. 33, v. 30 f., x. 40 f.
[3] *Ib.*, ii. 41.
[4] *Ib.*, iv. 4. There may be doubt as to the number on this occasion.
[5] *Ib.*, ii. 41.
[6] *Ib.*, viii. 35 f.
[7] *Ib.*, x. 47 f.

of worship believed to have been, in the most direct sense, instituted by God himself, the most clear, strong, and reiterated order would have been requisite. No one can reasonably maintain that a few spiritual expressions directed against the bare letter and abuse of the law, which were scarcely understood by the hearers, could have been intended to abolish a system so firmly planted, or to overthrow Jewish institutions of such antiquity and national importance, much less that they could be taken in this sense by the disciples. A few passages in the Gospels, therefore, which may bear the interpretation of having foreseen the eventful supersession of Mosaism by his own more spiritual principles, must not be strained to support the idea that Jesus taught disregard of the Law. His very distinct and positive lessons, conveyed both by precept and practice, show, on the contrary, that not only he did not intend to attack pure Mosaism, but that he was understood both directly and by inference to recognise and confirm it.

In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus states to the disciples in the most positive manner: "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall not pass from the law, till all be accomplished."[1] Whether the last phrase be interpreted "till all the law be accomplished," or "till all things appointed to occur be accomplished," the effect is the same. One clear explicit declaration like this, under the circumstances, would outweigh a host of doubtful expressions. Not only does Jesus in this passage directly repudiate any idea of attacking the law and the prophets, but, in representing his mission as their fulfilment, he affirms them, and associates his own work in the closest way with theirs. If there were any uncertainty, however, as to the meaning of his words, it would be removed by the continuation: "Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these commandments, even the least, and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."[2] It would be difficult for teaching to be more decisive in favour of the maintenance of the law, and this instruction, according to the first Synoptic, was specially directed to the disciples.[3] When Jesus goes on to show that their righteousness must exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, and to add to the letter of the law, as interpreted by those of old, his own profound interpretation of its spirit, he only intensifies, without limiting, the operation of the

[1] Matt. v. 17, 18; cf. xxiii. 2 f.; cf. Luke xvi. 17.

[2] *Ib.*, v. 19. Hilgenfeld (*Einl. N. T.*, p. 469 f.) and some others consider this, as well as other parts of the Sermon on the Mount, to be inserted as a direct attack upon Pauline teaching.

[3] Matt. v. 1, 2.

law; he merely spiritualises it. He does no more than this in his lessons regarding the observance of the Sabbath. He did not, in point of fact, attack the genuine Mosaic institution of the day of rest at all, but merely the intolerable literalism by which its observance had been made a burden instead of "a delight." He justified his variation from the traditional teaching and practice of his time by appeals to Scriptural precedent.[1] As Dr. Farrar has said: ".....the observance of the Sabbath, which had been intended to secure for weary men a rest full of love and peace and mercy, had become a mere national fetish—a barren custom fenced in with the most frivolous and senseless restrictions."[2] Jesus restored its original significance.

In restricting some of the permissive clauses of the law, on the other hand, he acted precisely in the same spirit. He dealt with the law not with the temper of a revolutionist, but of a reformer, and his reforms, so far from affecting its permanence, are a virtual confirmation of the rest of the code.[3] Ritschl, whose views on this point will have some weight with Apologists, combats the idea that Jesus merely confirmed the Mosaic moral law and abolished the ceremonial law. Referring to one particular point of importance, he says: "He certainly contests the duty of the Sabbath rest, the value of purifications and sacrifices, and the validity of divorce; on the other hand, he leaves unattacked the value of circumcision, whose regulation is generally reckoned as part of the ceremonial law; and nothing justifies the conclusion that Jesus estimated it in the same way as Justin Martyr, and the other Gentile Christian Church teachers, who place it on the same line as the ceremonies. The only passage in which Jesus touches upon circumcision (John vii. 22) rather proves that, as an institution of the patriarchs, he attributes to it peculiar sanctity. Moreover, when Jesus, with unmistakable intention, confines his own personal ministry to the Israelitish people (Mark vii. 27, Matt. x. 5, 6), he thereby recognises their prior right of participation in the kingdom of God, and also, indirectly, circumcision as the sign of the preference of this people. The distinction of circumcision from ceremonies, besides, is perfectly intelligible from the Old Testament. Through circumcision, to wit, is the Israelite, sprung from the people of the Covenant, indicated as sanctified by God: through purification, sacrifice, Sabbath rest, must he continually sanctify himself for God. So long, therefore, as the conception of the people of the Covenant is maintained, circumcision cannot

[1] Matt. xii. 3 f.; Mark ii. 25 f.; Luke vi. 3 f.

[2] Farrar, *Life of Christ*, i., p. 375, cf. p. 431 f., ii. 115 f.

[3] Ritschl limits the application of much of the modification of the law ascribed to Jesus to the disciples, as members of the "kingdom of God" (*Entst. altk. Kirche*, p. 29 f.).

be abandoned, whilst even the prophets have pointed to the merely relative importance of the Mosaic worship."[1]

Jesus everywhere in the Gospels recognises the divine origin of the law,[2] and he quotes the predictions of the prophets as absolute evidence of his own pretensions. To those who ask him the way to eternal life he indicates its commandments,[3] and he even enjoins the observance of its ceremonial rites.[4] Jesus did not abrogate the Mosaic law; but, on the contrary, by his example as well as his precepts he practically confirmed it. According to the statements of the Gospels, Jesus himself observed the prescriptions of the Mosaic law. From his birth he had been brought up in its worship.[5] He was circumcised on the eighth day.[6] "And when the days of their purification were accomplished, according to the law of Moses, they brought him up to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord, even as it is written in the law of the Lord: Every male, etc., and to give a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord," etc.[7] Every year his parents went to Jerusalem at the feast of the Passover,[8] and this practice he continued till the close of his life. "As his custom was, he went into the synagogue (at Nazareth) and stood up to read."[9] According to the fourth Gospel, Jesus goes up to Jerusalem for the various festivals of the Jews,[10] and the feast of the Passover, according to the Synoptics, was the last memorable supper eaten with his disciples,[11] the third Synoptic representing him as saying: "With desire I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you that I shall not any more eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God."[12] However exceptional the character of Jesus, and however elevated his views, it is undeniable that he lived and died a Jew, conforming to the ordinances of the Mosaic law in all essential points, and not holding himself aloof from the worship of the Temple which he purified. The influence which his adherence to the forms of Judaism must have exerted over his followers can scarcely be exaggerated, and the fact must ever be carefully borne in mind in estimating the conduct of the Apostles and of the primitive Christian community after his death.

As befitted the character of the Jewish Messiah, the sphere of

[1] Ritschl, *Entst. altk. Kirche*, p. 34, cf. 46 f.

[2] Matt. xv. 4, etc. Paley says: "Undoubtedly our Saviour assumes the divine origin of the Mosaic institution" (*A View of the Evidences*, etc., ed. Potts, 1850, p. 262).

[3] Matt. xix. 17; Mark x. 17; Luke xviii. 18; x. 25 f., xv. 29, 31, 32.

[4] Matt. viii. 4; Luke v. 14; John vii. 8. [5] Cf. Gal. iv. 4.

[6] Luke ii. 21. [7] *Ib.*, ii. 22 f. [8] *Ib.*, ii. 41. [9] *Ib.*, iv. 16.

[10] John v. 1, vii. 8, 10, x. 22 f., xi. 55, 56, xii. 1, 12; xiii. 1 f.

[11] Matt. xxvi. 17 f.; Mark xiv. 12 f.; Luke xxii. 7 f.

[12] Luke xxii. 15 f.

the ministry of Jesus and the arrangements for the proclamation of the Gospel were strictly, and even intensely, Judaic. Jesus attached to his person twelve disciples, a number clearly typical of the twelve tribes of the people of Israel; and this reference is distinctly adopted when Jesus is represented, in the Synoptics, as promising that, in the Messianic kingdom, "when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory," the Twelve also "shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel";[1] a promise which, according to the third Synoptist, is actually made during the last supper.[2] In the Apocalypse, which, "of all the writings of the New Testament, is most thoroughly Jewish in its language and imagery,"[3] the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb are written upon the twelve foundations of the wall of the heavenly Jerusalem, upon the twelve gates of which, through which alone access to the city can be obtained, are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel.[4] Jesus himself limited his teaching to the Jews, and was strictly "a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." To the prayer of the Canaanitish woman, "Have mercy on me, O Lord, Son of David," unlike his gracious demeanour to her of the bloody issue,[5] Jesus at first, it is said, "answered her not a word"; and even when besought by the disciples — not to heal her daughter, but — to "send her away," he makes the emphatic declaration: "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel."[6] To her continued appeals he lays down the principle: "It is not lawful to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs." If after these exclusive sentences the boon is finally granted, it is as of the crumbs[7] which fall from the master's table. The modified expression in the second Gospel, "Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs," does not affect the case, for it equally represents exclusion from the privileges of Israel, and the Messianic idea fully contemplated a certain grace to the heathen when the children were filled. The expression regarding casting the children's bread "to the dogs" is clearly in reference to the Gentiles, who were so called by the Jews. A similar, though still stronger, use of such expressions might be pointed out in the Sermon on the Mount in the first Gospel (vii. 6): "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your

[1] Matt. xix. 28. [2] Luke xxii. 30.
[3] Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Ep. to the Galatians*, 4th ed., p. 343.
[4] Rev. xxi. 12, 14. [5] Matt. ix. 22.
[6] This expression does not occur in the parallel in Mark.
[7] These ψίχια, it is supposed, may mean the morsels of bread on which the hands were wiped after they had, in Eastern fashion, been thrust into the dishes before them.

pearls before swine." It is certain that the Jews were in the habit of speaking of the heathen both as dogs and swine—unclean animals—and Hilgenfeld[1] and some other critics see in this verse a reference to the Gentiles. We do not, however, press this application, which is, and may be, disputed, but merely mention it and pass on. There can be no doubt, however, of the exclusive references to the Gentiles in the same sermon and other passages, where the disciples are enjoined to practise a higher righteousness than the Gentiles. "Do not even the publicans.....do not even the Gentiles or sinners the same things."[2] "Take no thought, etc., for after all these things do the Gentiles seek; but seek ye, etc."[3] The contrast is precisely that put with some irony by Paul, making use of the common Jewish expression "sinner" as almost equivalent for "Gentile."[4] In another place the first Synoptic represents Jesus as teaching his disciples how to deal with a brother who sins against them, and as the final resource, when every effort at reconciliation and justice has failed, he says: "Let him be unto thee as the Gentile (ἐθνικὸς) and the publican" (Matt. xviii. 17). He could not express in a stronger way to a Jewish mind the idea of social and religious excommunication.

The instructions which Jesus gives in sending out the Twelve express the exclusiveness of the Messianic mission to the Jews, in the first instance, at least, in a very marked manner. Jesus commands his disciples: "Go not into a way of the Gentiles (ἐθνῶν), and into a city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach, saying: The kingdom of heaven is at hand."[5] As if more emphatically to mark the limitation of the mission, the assurance is seriously added: "For verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man come."[6] It will be observed that Jesus here charges the Twelve to go rather "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" in the same words that he employs to the Canaanitish woman to describe the exclusive destination of his own ministry.[7] In coupling the Samaritans with the Gentiles there is merely an expression of the intense antipathy of the Jews against them as a mixed and, we

[1] Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien*, p. 64; *Einl.*, p. 470; Reuss, *Théol. Chr.*, ii., p. 348; cf. Schoettgen, *Horæ Hebr.*, p. 87; Keim, *Jesu v. Nazara*, ii., p. 406, anm. 3; Köstlin, *Urspr. synopt. Evv.*, p. 178.

[2] Matt. v. 46 f., vi. 7 f.; cf. Luke vi. 32 f., where "sinners" is substituted for "Gentiles."

[3] Matt. vi. 31 f.; cf. xx. 25 f.; Luke xii. 30.

[4] Gal. ii. 15; cf. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Ep. to Gal.*, 4th ed., p. 114.

[5] Matt. x. 5–7; cf. Mark iii. 13 f., vi. 7 f.; Luke ix. 1 f.

[6] Matt. x. 23. [7] *Ib.*, xv.; cf. Acts iii. 25, 26, xiii. 46.

may say, renegade race excluded from the Jewish worship, although circumcised, intercourse with whom is to this day almost regarded as pollution.[1]

The third Gospel, which omits the restrictive instructions of Jesus to the Twelve given by the first Synoptist, introduces another episode of the same description—the appointment and mission of seventy disciples,[2] to which we must very briefly refer. No mention whatever is made of the incident in the other Gospels, and these disciples are not referred to in any other part of the New Testament.[3] Even Eusebius remarks that no catalogue of them is anywhere given,[4] and, after naming a few persons, who were said by tradition to have been of their number, he points out that more than seventy disciples appear, for instance, according to the testimony of Paul.[5] It will be observed that the instructions supposed to be given to the Seventy in the third Synoptic are, in the first, at least in considerable part, the very instructions given to the Twelve. There has been much discussion regarding the whole episode, which need not here be minutely referred to. For various reasons the majority of critics impugn its historical character. A large number of these, as well as other writers, consider that the narrative of this appointment of seventy disciples, the number of the nations of the earth according to Jewish ideas, was introduced in Pauline universalistic interest, or, at least, that the number is typical of Gentile conversion, in contrast with that of the Twelve who represent the more strictly Judaic limitation of the Messianic mission; and they seem to hold that the preaching of the Seventy is represented as not confined to Judæa, but as extending to Samaria, and that it thus denoted the extension of the Gospel also to the Gentiles. On the other hand, other critics, many, though by no means all, of whom do not question the authenticity of the passage, are disposed to deny the Pauline tendency and any special connection with a mission to the Gentiles, and rather to see in the number seventy a reference to well-known Judaistic institutions. It is true that the number of the nations was set down at seventy by Jewish tradition,[6] but, on the other hand, it was the number of the elders

[1] Farrar, *Life of Christ*, i., 208 f.

[2] Luke x. 1 f. We need not discuss the precise number, whether 70 or 72. The very same uncertainty exists regarding the number of the elders and of the nations.

[3] Even Thiersch is struck by this singular fact. "It is remarkable," he says, "that no further mention of the seventy disciples of Christ (Luke x. 1) occurs in the N. T., and that no credible tradition regarding them is preserved" (*Die Kirche im ap. Zeit.*, p. 79, anm. 2).

[4] Euseb., *H. E.*, i. 12. [5] *Ib.*, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 5 f.

[6] See p. 63; *Clem. Recog.*, ii. 42; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, i. 5; Eisenmenger, *Entd. Judenthum*, ii., p. 3 f., p. 736 f.

chosen by Moses from amongst the children of Israel by God's command to help him, and to whom God gave of his spirit;[1] and also of the national Sanhedrin, which, according to the Mischna,[2] still represented the Mosaic council. This view receives confirmation from the *Clementine Recognitions* in the following passage: "He, therefore, chose us twelve who first believed in him, whom he named Apostles; afterwards seventy-two other disciples of most approved goodness, that, even in this way, recognising the similitude of Moses, the multitude might believe that this is the prophet to come, whom Moses foretold."[3] The passage here referred to is twice quoted in the Acts: "Moses indeed said: A prophet will the Lord our God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me," etc.[4] On examination, we do not find that there is any ground for the assertion that the seventy disciples were sent to the Samaritans or Gentiles, or were in any way connected with universalistic ideas. Jesus had "stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem," and sent messengers before him who "went and entered into a village of the Samaritans to make ready for him," but they repulsed him, "because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem."[5] There is a decided break before the appointment of the Seventy. "After these things (μετὰ ταῦτα) the Lord appointed seventy others also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place whither he himself was about to come."[6] There is not a single word in the instructions given to them which justifies the conclusion that they were sent to Samaria, and only the inference from the number seventy, taken as typical of the nations, suggests it. That inference is not sufficiently attested, and the slightness of the use made of the seventy disciples in the third Gospel—this occasion being the only one on which they are mentioned, and no specific intimation of any mission to all people being here given—does not favour the theory of Pauline tendency. So far as we are concerned the point is unimportant. Those who assert the universalistic character of the episode generally deny its authenticity; most of those who accept it as historical deny its universalism.

[1] Numbers xi. 16 f., 25 f.; also the number of the sons of Jacob who went into Egypt (Gen. xlvi. 27).

[2] *Sanhedr.*, i. 6.

[3] *Nos ergo primos elegit duodecim sibi credentes, quos Apostolos nominavit, postmodum alios septuaginta duos probatissimos discipulos, ut vel hoc modo recognita imagine Moysis crederet multitudo, quia hic est, quem praedixit Moysis venturum prophetam* (*Recog.*, i. 40; cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justins*, p. 356 f.). Hilgenfeld suggests the possibility of an earlier tradition out of which both the third Synoptist and the Clementines may have drawn their materials.

[4] Acts iii. 22, vii. 37; cf. Deuteron. xviii. 18.

[5] Luke ix. 51 f.

[6] *Ib.*, x. 1.

The order to go and teach all nations by no means carries us beyond strictly Messianic limits. Whilst the Jews expected the Messiah to restore the people of Israel to their own Holy Land and crown them with unexampled prosperity and peace, revenging their past sorrows upon their enemies, and granting them supremacy over all the earth, they likewise held that one of the Messianic glories was to be the conversion of the Gentiles to the worship of Jahveh. This is the burden of the prophets, and it requires no proof. The Jews, as the people with whom God had entered into Covenant, were first to be received into the kingdom. "Let the children first be filled,"[1] and then the heathen might partake of the bread. Regarding the ultimate conversion of the Gentiles, therefore, there was no doubt; the only questions were as to the time and the conditions of admission into the national fellowship. As to the time, there never had been any expectation that the heathen could be turned to Jahveh in numbers before the appearance of the Messiah, but converts to Judaism had been made in all ages, and after the dispersion, especially, the influence of the Jews upon the professors of the effete and expiring religions of Rome, of Greece, and of Egypt was very great, and numerous proselytes adopted the faith of Israel, and were eagerly sought for,[2] in spite of the abusive terms in which the Talmudists spoke of them.[3]

The conditions, on the other hand, were perfectly definite. The case of converts had been early foreseen and provided for in the Mosaic code. Without referring to minor points, we may at once say that circumcision was indispensable to admission into the number of the children of Israel.[4] Participation in the privileges of the Covenant could only be secured by accepting the mark of that Covenant. Very many, however, had adopted Judaism to a great extent who were not willing to undergo the rite requisite to full admission into the nation, and a certain modification had gradually been introduced by which, without it, strangers might be admitted into partial communion with Israel. There were, therefore, two classes of proselytes: the first called Proselytes of the Covenant or of Righteousness, who were circumcised, obeyed the whole Mosaic law, and were fully incorporated with Israel; and the other called Proselytes of the Gate, or worshippers of Jahveh, who in the New Testament are commonly called *οἱ σεβόμενοι τὸν Θεόν*, or *οἱ εὐσεβεῖς*. These had not undergone the rite of circumcision, and therefore were not participators in the Covenant, but

[1] Mark viii. 27. [2] Matt. xxiii. 15.

[3] They were said to be "as a scab to Israel." *Bab. Middah.* fol. xiii. 2; Lightfoot, *Horæ. Hebr.*, *Works*, xi., p. 282.

[4] Exod. xii. 48; Numb. ix. 14; cf. Ex. xii. 19, etc.

merely worshipped the God of Israel, and were only compelled to observe the seven Noachian prescriptions. These Proselytes of the Gate, however, were little more than on sufferance. They were excluded from the Temple, and even the Acts of the Apostles represent it to be pollution for a Jew to have intercourse with them: it requires direct divine intervention to induce Peter to go to Cornelius, and to excuse his doing so in the eyes of the primitive Church.[1] Nothing short of circumcision and full observance of the Mosaic law could secure the privileges of the Covenant with Israel to a stranger, and in illustration of this we may again point to the Acts, where certain who came from Judæa, members of the primitive Church, teach the Christians of Antioch: "Except ye have been circumcised after the custom of Moses ye cannot be saved."[2] This will be more fully shown as we proceed.

The conversion of the Gentiles was not, therefore, in the least degree an idea foreign to Judaism, but, on the contrary, formed an intimate part of the Messianic expectation of the later prophets. The conditions of admission to the privileges and promises of the Covenant, however, were full acceptance of the Mosaic law and submission to the initiatory rite. That small and comparatively insignificant people, with an arrogance that would have been ridiculous if, in the influence which they have actually exerted over the world, it had not been almost sublime, not only supposed themselves the sole and privileged recipients of the oracles of God, as his chosen and peculiar people, but they contemplated nothing short of universal submission to the Mosaic code, and the supremacy of Israel over all the earth.

We are now better able to estimate the position of the Twelve when the death of their Master threw them on their own resources, and left them to propagate his Gospel as they themselves understood it. Born a Jew of the race of David, accepting during his life the character of the promised Messiah, and dying with the mocking title "King of the Jews" written upon his cross, Jesus had left his disciples in close communion with the Mosaism which he had spiritualised and ennobled, but had not abolished. He himself had taught them that "it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness," and from his youth upwards had set them the example of enlightened observance of the Mosaic law. His precept had not belied his example, and, whilst in strong terms we find him inculcating the permanence of the Law, it is certain that he left no order to disregard it. He confined his own preaching to the Jews;

[1] Acts x. 2 f., xi. 2 f. Dr. Lightfoot says: "The Apostles of the circumcision, even St. Peter himself, had failed hitherto to comprehend the wide purpose of God. With their fellow-countrymen they still 'held it unlawful for a Jew to keep company with an alien' (Acts x. 28)" (*Galatians*, p. 290).

[2] Acts xv. 1.

the first ministers of the Messiah represented the twelve tribes of the people of Israel ; and the first Christians were of that nation, with no distinctive worship, but practising as before the whole Mosaic ritual. What Neander says of "many" may, we think, be referred to all : "That Jesus faithfully observed the form of the Jewish law served to them as evidence that this form should ever preserve its value."[1] As a fact, the Apostles and the early Christians continued as before assiduously to practise all the observances of the Mosaic law, to frequent the Temple,[2] and adhere to the usual strict forms of Judaism. In addition to the influence of the example of Jesus and the powerful effect of national habit, there were many strong reasons which obviously must to Jews have rendered abandonment of the law as difficult as submission to its full requirements must have been to Gentiles. Holding as they did the Divine origin of the Old Testament, in which the observance of the Law was inculcated on almost every page, it would have been impossible, without counter-teaching of the most peremptory and convincing character, to have shaken its supremacy ; but, beyond this, in that theocratic community Mosaism was not only the condition of the Covenant and the key of the Temple, but it was also the diploma of citizenship, and the bond of social and political life. To abandon the observance of the Law was not only to resign the privilege and the distinctive characteristic of Israel, to relinquish the faith of the Patriarchs who were the glory of the nation, and to forsake a divinely appointed form of worship, without any recognised or even indicated substitute, but it severed the only link between the individual and the people of Israel, and left him in despised isolation, an outcast from the community. They had no idea that any such sacrifice was required of them. They were simply Jews believing in the Jewish Messiah, and they held that all things else were to proceed as before, until the glorious second coming of the Christ.

The Apostles and the primitive Christians continued to hold the national belief that the way to Christianity lay through Judaism, and that the observance of the law was obligatory and circumcision necessary to complete communion. Paul describes with unappeased irritation the efforts made by the community of Jerusalem, whose "pillars" were Peter, James, and John, to force Titus, a Gentile Christian, to be circumcised,[3] and even the Acts represent James and all the elders of the Church of Jerusalem as

[1] *Pflanzung, u. s. w.*, p. 47.

[2] Acts ii. 46, iii. 1, v. 20, 42, xxi. 20–27, xxii. 17, etc.

[3] Gal. ii. 3 f. As we shall more fully discuss this episode hereafter, it is not necessary to do so here.

requesting Paul, long after, to take part with four Jewish Christians, who had a vow and were about to purify themselves and shave their heads and, after the accomplishment of the days of purification, make the usual offering in the Temple, in order to convince the "many thousands there of those who have believed, and are all zealous for the law," that it is untrue that he teaches: "all the Jews who are among the Gentiles apostacy (ἀποστασίαν) from Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs," and to show, on the contrary, that he himself walks orderly and keeps the Law.[1] As true Israelites, with opinions fundamentally unchanged by belief that Jesus was the Messiah, they held that the Gospel was specially intended for the people of the Covenant, and they confined their teaching to the Jews.[2] A Gentile, whilst still uncircumcised, even although converted, could not, they thought, be received on an equality with the Jew, but defiled him by contact.[3] The attitude of the Christian Jew to the merely Christian Gentile, who had not entered the community by the portal of Judaism, was, as before, simply that of the Jew to the proselyte of the Gate. The Apostles could not upon any other terms have then even contemplated the conversion of the Gentiles. Jesus had limited his own teaching to the Jews, and, according to the first Gospel, had positively prohibited, at one time at least, their going to the Gentiles, or even to the Samaritans, and if there had been an order to preach to all nations it certainly was not accompanied by any removal of the conditions specified in the Law.[4]

[1] Acts xxi. 18-26; cf. xv. i. Paul is also represented as saying to the Jews of Rome that he has done nothing "against the customs of their Fathers."

[2] Dr. Lightfoot says: "Meanwhile at Jerusalem some years passed away before the barrier of Judaism was assailed. The Apostles still observed the Mosaic ritual; they still confined their preaching to Jews by birth, or Jews by adoption, the proselytes of the Covenant," etc. (*Paul's Ep. to Gal.*, p. 287). Paley says: "It was not yet known to the Apostles that they were at liberty to propose the religion to mankind at large. That 'mystery,' as St. Paul calls it (Eph. iii. 3-6), and as it then was, was revealed to Peter by an especial miracle" (*A View of the Evidence*, etc., ed. Potts, 1850, p. 228).

[3] Acts x. 1 f., 14, 28; xi. 1 f.

[4] Dr. Lightfoot says: "The Master himself had left no express instructions. He had charged them, it is true, to preach the Gospel to all nations, but how this injunction was to be carried out, by what changes a national Church must expand into an universal Church, they had not been told. He had, indeed, asserted the sovereignty of the spirit over the letter; he had enunciated the great principle—as wide in its application as the law itself—that 'man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath for man.' He had pointed to the fulfilment of the law in the Gospel. So far he had discredited the law, but he had not deposed it or abolished it. It was left to the Apostles themselves, under the guidance of the Spirit, moulded by circumstances and moulding them in turn, to work out the great change" (*St. Paul's Ep. to Gal.*, p. 286).

It has been remarked that neither party, in the great discussion in the Church regarding the terms upon which Gentiles might be admitted to the privileges of Christianity, ever appealed in support of their views to specific instructions of Jesus on the subject. The reason is intelligible enough. The Petrine party, supported as they were by the whole weight of the Law and of Holy Scripture, as well as by the example and tacit approval of the Master, could not have felt even that degree of doubt which precedes an appeal to authority. The party of Paul, on the other hand, had nothing in their favour to which a specific appeal could have been made; but in his constant protest that he had not received his doctrine from man, but had been taught it by direct revelation, the Apostle of the Gentiles, who was the first to proclaim a substantial difference between Christianity and Judaism, in reality endeavoured to set aside the authority of the Judaistic party by an appeal from the earthly to the spiritualised Messiah. Even after the visit of Paul to Jerusalem about the year 50, the elder Apostles still retained the views which we have shown to have been inevitable under the circumstances, and, as we learn from Paul himself, they still continued mere "Apostles of the Circumcision," limiting their mission to the Jews.[1]

The Apostles and the primitive Christians, therefore, after the death of their Master, whom they believed to be the Messiah of the Jews, having received his last instructions and formed their final impressions of his views, remained Jews, believing in the continued obligation to observe the Law, and, consequently, holding the initiatory rite essential to participation in the privileges of the Covenant. They held this not only as Jews believing in the Divine origin of the Old Testament and of the law, but as Christians confirmed by the example and the teaching of their Christ, whose very coming was a substantial ratification of the ancient faith of Israel. In this position they stood when the Gospel, without their intervention, and mainly by the exertions of the Apostle Paul, began to spread amongst the Gentiles, and the terms of their admission came into question. It is impossible to deny that the total removal of conditions, advocated by the Apostle Paul with all the vehemence and warmth of his energetic character, and involving nothing short of the abrogation of the law and surrender of all the privileges of Israel, must have been shocking not only to the prejudices but also to the deepest religious convictions of men who, although Christians, had not ceased to be Jews, and, unlike the Apostle of the Gentiles, had been directly and daily in contact with Jesus,

[1] Gal. ii. 9.

without having been taught such revolutionary principles. From this point we have to proceed with our examination of the account in the Acts of the relation of the elder Apostles to Paul, and the solution of the difficult problem before them.

CHAPTER V.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK (CONTINUED): STEPHEN THE MARTYR

BEFORE the Apostle of the Gentiles himself comes on the scene, and is directly brought in contact with the Twelve, we have to study the earlier incidents narrated in the Acts, wherein it is said the emancipation of the Church from Jewish exclusiveness had already either commenced or been clearly anticipated. The first of these which demands our attention is the narrative of the martyrdom of Stephen. This episode, although highly interesting and important in itself, might, we consider, have been left unnoticed in connection with the special point now engaging our attention; but such significance has been imparted to it by the views which critics have discovered in the speech of Stephen that we cannot pass it without attention.

We read[1] that, in consequence of murmurs amongst the Hellenists against the Hebrews that their widows were neglected in the daily distribution of alms, seven deacons were appointed specially to attend to such ministrations. Amongst these, it is said, was Stephen, "a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit." Stephen, it appears, by no means limited his attention to the material interests of the members of the Church, but, being "full of grace and power, did great wonders and signs (*τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα μεγάλα*) amongst the people." "But there arose certain of those of the synagogue which is called (the synagogue) of the Libertines[2] and of the Cyrenians and of the Alexandrians and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, disputing with Stephen; and they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake. Then they suborned men who said: We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and God. And they stirred up the people and the elders and the scribes, and came upon him and seized him, and brought him to the Council, and set up false witnesses, who said: This man ceaseth not to speak words against the holy place and the law; for we have heard him say that Jesus, this Nazarene, shall destroy this place, and shall change the

[1] Acts vi. 1 f.

[2] The Libertines were probably Jewish freedmen, or the descendants of freedmen, who had returned to Jerusalem from Rome.

customs which Moses delivered to us." The high priest asks him: Are these things so? And Stephen delivers an address, which has since been the subject of much discussion amongst critics and divines. The contents of the speech, taken by themselves, do not present any difficulty so far as the sense is concerned; but, regarded as a reply to the accusations brought against him by the false witnesses, the defence of Stephen has perhaps been interpreted in a greater variety of ways than any other part of the New Testament. Its shadowy outlines have been used as a setting for the pious thoughts of subsequent generations, and every imaginable intention has been ascribed to the proto-martyr, every possible or impossible reference detected in the phrases of his oration. This has mainly arisen from the imperfect nature of the account in the Acts, and the absence of many important details, which has left criticism to adopt that "*divinatorisch-combinatorische*" procedure which is so apt to evolve any favourite theory from the inner consciousness.

The prevailing view amongst the great majority of critics of all schools is, that Stephen is represented in the Acts as the forerunner of the Apostle Paul, anticipating his universalistic principles, and proclaiming with more or less of directness the abrogation of Mosaic ordinances and the freedom of the Christian Church.[1] This view was certainly advanced by Augustine, and lies at the base of his famous saying, "*Si sanctus Stephanus sic non orasset, ecclesia Paulum non haberet*";[2] but it was first clearly enunciated by Baur, who subjected the speech of Stephen to detailed analysis,[3] and his interpretation has to a large extent been adopted even by Apologists. It must be clearly understood that adherence to this reading of the aim and meaning of the speech, as it is given in the Acts, by no means involves an admission of its authenticity, which, on the contrary, is impugned by Baur himself, and by a large number of independent critics. We have the misfortune of differing most materially from the prevalent view regarding the contents of the speech, and we maintain that, as it stands in the Acts, there is not a word in it which can be legitimately construed into an attack upon the Mosaic law, or which anticipates the Christian universalism of Paul. Space, however, forbids our entering here upon a discussion of this subject; but the course which we must adopt with regard to it renders it unnecessary to deal with the interpretation of the speech. We consider that there is no reason for believing that the

[1] Holsten, we think rightly, denies that Stephen can be considered in any way the forerunner of Paul (*Zum Ev. Paulus u. Petr.*, p. 52 anm. * *, p. 253 anm. *).

[2] *Sermo i. in fest. St. Stephani.*

[3] *De orationis habitæ a Stephano consilio*, 1829; *Paulus u. s. w.*, i. 49 f.

discourse put into the mouth of Stephen was ever actually delivered, but, on the contrary, that there is every ground for holding that it is nothing more than a composition by the author of the Acts. We shall endeavour clearly to state the reasons for this conclusion.

With the exception of the narrative in the Acts, there is no evidence whatever that such a person as Stephen ever existed. The statements of the Apostle Paul leave no doubt that persecution against the Christians of Jerusalem must have broken out previous to his conversion, but no details are given, and it can scarcely be considered otherwise than extraordinary that Paul should not in any of his own writings have referred to the protomartyr of the Christian Church, if the account which is given of him be historical. It may be argued that his own share in the martyrdom of Stephen made the episode an unpleasant memory, which the Apostle would not readily recall. Considering the generosity of Paul's character, on the one hand, however, and the important position assigned to Stephen, on the other, this cannot be admitted as an explanation, and it is perfectly unaccountable that, if Stephen really be a historical personage, no mention of him occurs elsewhere in the New Testament.

Moreover, if Stephen was, as asserted, the direct forerunner of Paul, and in his hearing enunciated sentiments like those ascribed to him, already expressing much more than the germ — indeed, the full spirit — of Pauline universality, it would be passing strange that Paul not only tacitly ignores all that he owes to the protomartyr, but vehemently protests: "But I make known unto you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached by me is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was taught it, but by revelation of Jesus Christ."[1] There is no evidence that such a person exercised any such influence on Paul.[2] One thing only is certain, that the speech and martyrdom of Stephen made so little impression on Paul that, according to Acts, he continued a bitter persecutor of Christianity, "making havoc of the Church."

The statement, vi. 8, that "Stephen, full of grace and power, did great wonders and signs among the people," is not calculated to increase confidence in the narrative as sober history; and as little is the assertion, vi. 15, that "all who sat in the Council, looking steadfastly on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel." This, we think, is evidently an instance of Christian

[1] Gal. i. 11, 12.

[2] It is further very remarkable, if it be assumed that the vision, Acts vii. 55, actually was seen, that, in giving a list of those who have seen the risen Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 5-8), which he evidently intends to be complete, he does not include Stephen.

subjective opinion made objective. How, we might ask, could it be known to the writer that all who sat at the Council saw this? Neander replies that probably it is the evidence of members of the Sanhedrin of the impression made on them by the aspect of Stephen.[1] The intention of the writer, however, obviously is to describe a supernatural phenomenon, and this is in his usual manner in this book, where miraculous agency is more freely employed than in any other in the Canon. The session of the Council commences in a regular manner,[2] but the previous arrest of Stephen,[3] and the subsequent interruption of his defence, are described as a tumultuous proceeding, his death being unsanctioned by any sentence of the Council.[4] The Sanhedrin, indeed, could not execute any sentence of death without the ratification of the Roman authorities,[5] and nothing is said in the narrative which implies that any regular verdict was pronounced; but, on the contrary, the tumult described in v. 57 f. excludes such a supposition. Olshausen[6] considers that, in order to avoid any collision with the Roman power, the Sanhedrin did not pronounce any formal judgment, but connived at the execution which some fanatics carried out. This explanation is inadmissible, because it is clear that the members of the Council themselves, if also the audience, attacked and stoned Stephen. The actual stoning[7] is carried out with all regard to legal forms, the victim

[1] *Pflanzung, u. s. w.*, p. 68. [2] vi. 13 f., vii. 1. [3] vi. 11, 12.

[4] Humphrey (*On the Acts*, p. 668 f.), with a few others, thinks there was a regular sentence. De Wette (*K. Erkl. Apostelgesch.*, p. 114) thinks it more probable that there was a kind of sentence pronounced, and that the reporter, not having been an eye-witness, does not quite correctly state the case.

[5] John xviii. 31. Cf. Origen, *Ad African.*, § 14; Alford, *Gk. Test.*, ii., p. 82 f.; Baur, *Paulus*, i., p. 62; von Döllinger, *Christ. u Kirche*, p. 456 f.; Holtzmann, *in Bunsen's Bibelw.*, viii., p. 338; Neander, *Pflanzung*, p. 72 f.; Olshausen, *Apg.*, p. 125; Weizsäcker, *in Schenkel's Bib. Lex.*, v., p. 387; Zeller, *Apg.*, p. 150. It is argued, however, that the trial of Stephen probably took place just after the recall of Pontius Pilate, either in an interval when the Roman Procurator was absent, or when one favourable to the Jews had replaced Pilate. A most arbitrary explanation, for which no ground, but the narrative which requires defence, can be given.

[6] *Die Apostelgesch.*, 125.

[7] It is said both in v. 58 and v. 59 that "they stoned" him. The double use of the term ἐλιθοβόλουν has called forth many curious explanations. Heinrichs (ad vii. 57, p. 205), and after him Kuinoel (iv., p. 288), explain the first as meaning only that they prepared to stone him, or that they wantonly threw stones at him on the way to the place of execution. Olshausen (on vii. 57 60, p. 125) considers the first to be a mere anticipation of the second more definitely described stoning. So also Meyer (on vii. 57, p. 193). Bleek (*Einl. N. T.*, p. 341 f.) conjectures that the author only found it stated generally in the written source which he uses, as in v. 58, that they cast Stephen out of the city and stoned him, and that, from mere oral tradition, he inserted the second ἐλιθοβόλουν, v. 59, for the sake of what is there related about Saul.

being taken out of the city,[1] and the witnesses casting the first stone,[2] and for this purpose taking off their outer garments.

The whole account, with its singular mixture of lawlessness and formality, is extremely improbable, and more especially when the speech itself is considered. The proceedings commence in an orderly manner, and the high priest calls upon Stephen for his defence. The Council and audience listen patiently and quietly to his speech, and no interruption takes place until he has said all that he had to say; for it must be apparent that, when the speaker abandons narrative and argument and breaks into direct invective, there could not have been any intention to prolong the address, as no expectation of calm attention after such denunciations could have been natural. The tumult cuts short the oration precisely where the author had exhausted his subject, and by temporary lawlessness overcomes the legal difficulty of a sentence which the Sanhedrin, without the ratification of the Roman authority, could not have carried out. As soon as the tumult has effected these objects, all becomes orderly and legal again; and, consequently, the witnesses can lay their garments "at a young man's feet whose name was Saul." The principal actor in the work is thus dramatically introduced. As the trial commences with a supernatural illumination of the face of Stephen, it ends with a supernatural vision, in which Stephen sees heaven opened, and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God. Such a trial and such an execution present features which are undoubtedly not historical.

This impression is certainly not lessened when we find how many details of the trial and death of Stephen are based on the accounts in the Gospels of the trial and death of Jesus. The irritated adversaries of Stephen stir up the people and the elders and scribes, and come upon him and lead him to the Council.[3] They seek false witness against him;[4] and these false witnesses accuse him of speaking against the temple and the law.[5] The false witnesses who are set up against Jesus with similar testimony, according to the first two Synoptics, are strangely omitted by the third. The reproduction of this trait here has much that is suggestive. The high priest asks: "Are these things so?"[6] Stephen, at the close of his speech, exclaims: "I see the heavens opened,

[1] Levit. xxiv. 14. [2] Deut. xvii. 7.

[3] Acts vi. 12; cf. Luke xxii. 66, Matt. xxvi. 57.

[4] Acts vi. 11; cf. Matt. xxvi. 59, Mark xiv. 55.

[5] Acts vi. 13 f.; cf. Matt. xxvi. 60 f., Mark xiv. 57 f.

[6] The words in Acts vii. 1 are: εἶπεν δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεύς· Εἰ (ἄρα) ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχει; in Matt. xxvi. 63, ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἐξορκίζω σε..... ἵνα ἡμῖν εἴπῃς εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς.....; in Luke xxii. 66.....λέγοντες· Εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, εἰπὸν ἡμῖν. Cf. Zeller, *Die Apostelg.*, p. 153, anm. 2.

and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." Jesus says: "Henceforth shall the Son of Man be seated on the right hand of the power of God."[1] Whilst he is being stoned, Stephen prays, saying: "Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit"; and, similarly, Jesus on the cross cries, with a loud voice: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit; and, having said this, he expired."[2] Stephen, as he is about to die, cries, with a loud voice: "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge; and when he said this he fell asleep"; and Jesus says: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."[3] These two sayings of Jesus are not given anywhere but in the third Synoptic,[4] and their imitation by Stephen, in another work of the same Evangelist, is a peculiarity which deserves attention. It is argued by Apologists that nothing is more natural than that the first martyrs should have the example of the suffering Jesus in their minds, and die with his expressions of love and resignation on their lips. On the other hand, taken along with other most suspicious circumstances which we have already pointed out, and with the fact, which we shall presently demonstrate, that the speech of Stephen is nothing more than a composition by the author of Acts, the singular analogies presented by this narrative with the trial and last words of Jesus in the Gospels seem to us an additional indication of its inauthenticity. As Baur[5] and Zeller[6] have well argued, the use of two expressions of Jesus only found in the third Synoptic is a phenomenon which is much more naturally explained by attributing them to the author, who of course knew that Gospel well, than to Stephen, who did not know it at all.[7] The prominence which is given to this episode of the first Christian martyrdom is intelligible in itself, and it acquires fresh significance when it is considered as the introduction of the Apostle Paul, whose perfect silence regarding the proto-martyr, however, confirms the belief which we otherwise acquire, that the whole narrative and speech, whatever unknown

[1] Acts vii. 56, Luke xxii. 69.

[2] .....λέγοντα· Κύριε Ἰησοῦ, δέξαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. Acts vii. 59. καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν. Luke xxiii. 46.

[3] .....ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· Κύριε, μὴ στήσῃς αὐτοῖς ταύτην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐκοιμήθη. Acts vii. 60.

[4] ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν· Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν. Luke xxiii. 34.

[5] *Paulus*, i., p. 64, anm. 1. [6] *Apostelgesch.*, 152.

[7] Neander admits that the narrative in Acts is wanting in clearness and intuitive evidence of details, although he does not think that this at all militates against the trustworthiness of the whole (*Pflanzung, u. s. w.*, p. 68, anm.). Bleek points out that viii. 1 3, which is so closely connected with this episode, shows a certain confusion and want of clearness, and supposes the passage interpolated by the author into the original narrative of which he made use (*Einl. N. T.*, p. 342).

tradition may have suggested them, are to be ascribed to the author of the Acts.

On closer examination, one of the first questions which arises is, How could such a speech have been reported? Although Neander[1] contends that we are not justified in asserting that all that is narrated regarding Stephen in the Acts occurred in a single day, we think it cannot be doubted that the intention is to describe the arrest, trial, and execution as rapidly following each other on the same day. "They came upon him, and seized him, and brought him to the Council, and set up false witnesses, who said," etc.[2] There is no ground here for interpolating any imprisonment, and, if not, then it follows clearly that Stephen, being immediately called upon to answer for himself, is, at the end of his discourse, violently carried away without the city to be stoned. No preparations could have been made even to take notes of his speech, if upon any ground it were reasonable to assume the possibility of an intention to do so; and indeed it could not, under the circumstances, have been foreseen that he should either have been placed in such a position or have been able to make a speech at all. The rapid progress of all the events described, and the excitement consequent on such tumultuous proceedings, render an ordinary explanation of the manner in which such a speech could have been preserved improbable, and it is difficult to suppose that it could have been accurately remembered, with all its curious details, by one who was present. Improbable as it is, however, this is the only suggestion which can possibly be advanced. The majority of Apologists suppose that the speech was heard and reported by the Apostle Paul himself, or at least that it was communicated or written down either by a member of the Sanhedrin or by some one who was present. As there is no information on the point, there is ample scope for imagination; but, when we come to consider its linguistic and other peculiarities, it must be borne in mind that the extreme difficulty of explaining the preservation of such a speech must be an element in judging whether it is not rather a composition by the author of Acts. The language in which it was delivered, again, is the subject of much difference of opinion, many maintaining that it must have originally been spoken in Aramaic, whilst others hold that it was delivered in Greek. Still, a large number of critics and divines of course assert that the speech attributed to Stephen is at least substantially authentic. As might naturally be expected in a case where negative criticism is arrayed against a canonical work upheld by the time-honoured authority of the Church, those who dispute its authenticity are in the minority. It is maintained by the latter that the language is

[1] *Pflanzung, u. s. w.*, p. 68, anm. [2] Acts vi. 12 f.

more or less that of the writer of the rest of the work, and that the speech, in fact, as it lies before us is a later composition by the author of the Acts of the Apostles.

Before examining the linguistic peculiarities of the speech, we may very briefly point out that, in the course of the historical survey, many glaring contradictions of the statements of the Old Testament occur.[1] Stephen says (vs. 2, 3) that the order to Abraham to leave his country was given to him in Mesopotamia before he dwelt in Haran; but according to Genesis (xii. 1 f.) the call is given whilst he was living in Haran. The speech (v. 4) represents Abraham leaving Haran after the death of his father, but this is in contradiction to Genesis, according to which[2] Abraham was 75 when he left Haran. Now, as he was born when his father Terah was 70,[3] and Terah lived 205 years,[4] his father was only 145 at the time indicated, and afterwards lived 60 years. In v. 5 it is stated that Abraham had no possession in the promised land, not even so much as to set his foot on; but, according to Genesis,[5] he brought the field of Ephron in Machpelah. It is said (v. 14) that Jacob went down into Egypt with 75 souls, whereas in the Old Testament it is repeatedly said that the number was 70.[6] In v. 16 it is stated that Jacob was buried in Schechem in a sepulchre bought by Abraham of the sons of Emmor in Schechem, whereas in Genesis[7] Jacob is said to have been buried in Machpelah; the sepulchre in Schechem, in which the bones of Joseph were buried, was not bought by Abraham, but by Jacob.[8] Moses is described (v. 22) as mighty in words; but in Exodus[9] he is said to be the very reverse, and Aaron, in fact, is sent with him to speak words for him. These are some of the principal variations. It used to be argued that such

[1] Dr. Wordsworth says of those who venture to observe them: "The allegations in question, when reduced to their plain meaning, involve the assumption that the Holy Ghost, speaking by St. Stephen (who was 'full of the Holy Spirit'), *forgot* what He Himself had written in the Book of Genesis; and that His Memory is to be refreshed by Biblical commentators of the nineteenth century! This kind of criticism is animated by a spirit very alien from that Christian temper of reverential modesty, gentleness, and humility, which are primary requisites for the discovery and reception of truth. *Mysteries are revealed to the meek* (Eccles. iii. 19). *Them that are meek shall He guide in judgment: and such as are gentle, them shall He learn His way* (Psalm xxv. 8). But such a spirit of criticism seems willing to accept any supposition, however fanciful, except that of its own fallibility! It is ready to allege that St. Luke is in error in saying that St. Stephen was full of the Holy Ghost. It is ready to affirm that St. Stephen was forgetful of the elements of Jewish history..... No wonder that it is given over by God to a reprobate mind" (*Greek Test.*, Acts of the Apostles, p. 66 f.).

[2] Gen. xii. 4. [3] xi. 26. [4] xi. 32. [5] xxiii. 4 f., 17 f.

[6] Gen. xlvi. 27, Exod. i. 5, Deut. x. 22. It must be added that in the last two passages the version of the lxx. also gives 75 including the sons of Joseph.

[7] xlix. 29, l. 13. [8] Joshua xxiv. 32. [9] iv. 10 f.

mistakes were mere errors of memory, natural in a speech delivered under such circumstances and without preparation,[1] and that they are additional evidence of its authenticity, inasmuch as it is very improbable that a writer deliberately composing such a speech could have committed them. It is very clear, however, that the majority of these are not errors of memory at all, but either the exegesis prevailing at the time amongst learned Jews, or traditions deliberately adopted, of which many traces are elsewhere found.

The form of the speech is closely similar to other speeches found in the same work. We have already, in passing, pointed out the analogy of parts of it to the address of Peter in Solomon's porch, but the speech of Paul at Antioch bears a still closer resemblance to it, and has been called "a mere echo of the speeches of Peter and Stephen."[2] We must refer the reader to our general comparison of the two speeches of Peter and Paul in question,[3] which sufficiently showed, we think, that they were not delivered by independent speakers, but, on the contrary, that they are nothing more than compositions by the author of the Acts. These addresses, which are such close copies of each other, are so markedly cast in the same mould as the speech of Stephen that they not only confirm our conclusions as to their own origin, but intensify suspicions of its authenticity. It is impossible, without reference to the speeches themselves, to show how closely that of Paul at Antioch is traced on the lines of the speech of Stephen, and this resemblance is much greater than can be shown by mere linguistic examination. The thoughts correspond where the words differ. There is a constant recurrence of words, however, even where the sense of the passages is not the same, and the ideas in both bear the stamp of a single mind. We shall not attempt fully to contrast these discourses here, for it would occupy too much space, and we therefore content ourselves with giving a few illustrations, begging the reader to examine the speeches themselves :—

Stephen.	Paul and Peter.
vii. 2. Men, brethren, fathers, hear.	xiii. 15. Men, brethren ..... 16. Men, Israelites, and ye that fear God, hear. "Ανδρες ἀδελφοὶ.....ἀκούσατε. xxii. 1. Men, brethren, and fathers, hear.....

[1] Even de Wette says: "The numerous historical errors are remarkable; they may most probably be ascribed to an unprepared speech" (*N. Exkl. Apostelgesch.*, p. 93).

[2] Schneckenburger, *Zweck der Apostelgesch.*, p. 130.

[3] See back, p. 623 f.

Stephen.	Paul and Peter.
Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατε.....	*Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατε.*
The God of glory (*ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης*)[1] appeared to our father (*τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν*) Abraham when he was in (*ὄντι ἐν τῇ* M.) Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in (*κατοικῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐν*) Haran, etc.	xiii. 17. The God of this people (*ὁ θεὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου*) Israel chose our fathers (*τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν*) and exalted the people in their sojourn in the land of Egypt (*ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ*).....
6.....that his seed should be a sojourner in a strange land (*πάροικον ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ*).....	
5.....and to his seed.....(*καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ*).[2]	iii. 25. Ye are the children.....of the covenant (*τῆς διαθήκης*) which God made with your fathers, saying unto Abraham: And in thy seed (*καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου*), etc.
8. And he gave him (Abraham) a covenant.....(*καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαθήκην*.....) of circumcision.[3]	(Luke xxiv. 19. Jesus.....mighty in deed and word (*δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ*.....))
22. (Moses) was mighty in his words and deeds (*ἦν δὲ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις αὐτοῦ*).	iii. 13. The God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, the God of our fathers. (*ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν* .....)
32. I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. (*Ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ.*)	
36. This (Moses) brought them (the people *τὸν λαὸν*) out (*ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς*) having worked wonders and signs[4] in the land of Egypt (*ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ*) and in the Red Sea, and in the wilderness forty years (*ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἔτη τεσσεράκοντα*). v. 42..... forty years in the wilderness..... (*ἔτη τεσσεράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*).	xiii. 17.....and exalted the people (*τὸν λαὸν*) in their sojourn in the land of Egypt (*ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ*), and with a high arm brought them out of it (*ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς*), 18. and for about the time of forty years[5] (*τεσσερακονταέτη*) nourished them in the wilderness (*ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*).
37. This is the Moses who said unto the children of Israel: A prophet shall God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me.....	iii. 22. Moses indeed said:[6] A prophet shall the Lord our God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me, etc.
42.....God delivered them up to serve the host of heaven (*ὁ θεὸς παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς λατρεύειν, κ. τ. λ.*).	(Rom i. 24.....God delivered them up.....to uncleanness (*παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς.....εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν, κ.τ.λ.* cf. 26.....*παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας*.....28.....*παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν*.....)).

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 8, *κύριος τῆς δόξης*; cf. lxx. Ps. xxviii. 3.

[2] Compare with this verse Rom. iv. 13; Gal. iii. 16, 29.

[3] Cf. Rom. iv. 11, *καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς.*

[4] .....*ποιήσας τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα*.....ii. 22.....*τέρασιν καὶ σημείοις οἷς ἐποίησεν*.....

[5] vii. 23 reads.....*τεσσερακονταέτης χρόνος*.....and xiii. 18.....*τεσσερακονταέτη χρόνον*.....and again vii. 23, *ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ*.....1 Cor. ii. 9, *ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη*.....

[6] The authorised version, on the authority of several important MSS., adds "unto the fathers"—"*πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας*"; but the balance of evidence is decidedly against the words.

STEPHEN.	PAUL AND PETER.
45. Which also our fathers..... brought in with Joshua when they took possession of the Gentiles (*τῶν ἐθνῶν*), whom God drave out before the face of our fathers, unto the days of David.	xiii. 19. And he destroyed seven nations (*ἔθνη*) in the land of Canaan,[1] and divided their land to them by lot.
46. Who found (*εὗρε*) favour with God.....	22.....he raised up unto them David as king, to whom also he bare witness and said: I found (*εὗρον*) David, a man after mine own heart, etc.
48. Howbeit, the Most High dwelleth not in what is made with hands (*οὐχ ὁ ὕψιστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ*), even as the prophet saith: 49. The heaven (*ὁ οὐρανός*) is my throne, and the earth (*ἡ γῆ*) is my footstool. 50. Did not my hand make all these things? (*Οὐχὶ ἡ χείρ μου ἐποίησεν πάντα ταῦτα*;)	xvii. 24 f. The God that made the world and all things therein (*ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ*), he being lord of heaven and earth (*οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς*) dwelleth not in temples made with hands (*οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ*), neither is served by men's hands (*χειρῶν*), etc.
51. Ye uncircumcised in hearts .....(*ἀπερίτμητοι καρδίαις.....*)	(Rom. ii. 29. Circumcision is of the heart, in spirit (*περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι κ. τ. λ.....*))
52. Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute? and they killed (*ἀπέκτειναν*) them which announced before of the coming of the righteous One (*τοῦ δικαίου*), of whom ye have become betrayers and murderers (*φονεῖς*).	xxii. 14.....the righteous One (*τὸν δίκαιον*) .....
	iii. 14. But ye denied the holy and righteous One (*τὸν δίκαιον*), and desired a murderer (*ἄνδρα φονέα*) to be granted unto you, 15. and killed (*ἀπεκτείνατε*) the Prince of Life, etc.
53. Ye received the law at the arrangements of angels.....(*ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων.....*)	(Gal. iii. 19. What then is the law? It was added.....; being arranged by means of angels.....(*τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; προσετέθη.....διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων .....*))
54. And hearing these things they were cut to their hearts (*ἀκούοντες δὲ ταῦτα διεπρίοντο*), and gnashed their teeth upon him.	v. 33. When they heard they were cut (to their hearts) (*οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες διεπρίοντο*) and took counsel to slay them.

It is argued that the speech of Stephen bears upon it the stamp of an address which was actually delivered. We are not able to discover any special indication of this. Such an argument, at the best, is merely the assertion of personal opinion, and cannot have any weight. It is quite conceivable that an oration actually spoken might lose its spontaneous character in a report, and, on the other hand, that a written composition might acquire oratorical reality from the skill of the writer. It would indeed exhibit great want of literary ability if a writer, composing a speech which he desires to represent as having actually been spoken, altogether

[1] vii. 11. Then came a famine upon all Egypt and Canaan.

failed to convey some impression of this. To have any application to the present case, however, it must not only be affirmed that the speech of Stephen has the stamp of an address really spoken, but that it has the character of one delivered under such extraordinary circumstances, without premeditation, and in the midst of tumultuous proceedings. It cannot, we think, be reasonably asserted that a speech like this is peculiarly characteristic of a man suddenly arrested by angry and excited opponents, and hurried before a council which, at its close, rushes upon him and joins in stoning him. Unless the defence attributed to Stephen be particularly characteristic of this, the argument in question falls to the ground. On the contrary, if the speech has one feature more strongly marked than another, it is the deliberate care with which the points referred to in the historical survey are selected and bear upon each other, and the art with which the climax is attained. In showing, as we have already done, that the speech betrays the handiwork of the author of the Acts, we have to a large extent disposed of any claim to peculiar individuality in the defence, and the linguistic analysis conclusively settles the source of the composition. We must point out here in continuation that, as in the rest of the work, all the quotations in the speech are from the Septuagint, and that the author follows that version even when it does not fairly represent the original.

A minute analysis of the language of the whole episode from vi. 9 to the end of the seventh chapter, in order to discover what linguistic analogy it bears to the rest of the Acts and to the third Synoptic, leads to the certain conviction that the speech of Stephen was composed by the author of the rest of the Acts of the Apostles.[1] It may not be out of place to quote some remarks of Lekebusch at the close of an examination of the language of the Acts in general, undertaken for the purpose of ascertaining the literary characteristics of the book, which, although originally having no direct reference to this episode in particular, may well serve to illustrate our own results: "An unprejudiced critic must have acquired the conviction from the foregoing linguistic examination that throughout the whole of the Acts of the Apostles, and partly also the Gospel, the same style of language and expression generally prevails, and, therefore, that our book is an original work, independent of written sources on the whole, and proceeding from a single pen. For when the same expressions are everywhere found; when a long row of words, which only recur in the Gospel and Acts, or comparatively only very seldom in other works of the New Testament, appear equally in all parts; when certain forms of

[1] This analysis will be found in the complete edition 1879, vol. iii., p. 164–175.

words, peculiarities of word-order, construction of phraseology, indeed even whole sentences, recur in different sections, a compilation out of documents by different earlier writers can no longer be thought of, and it is 'beyond doubt that we have to consider our writing as the work of a single author, who has impressed upon it the stamp of a distinct literary style' (Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1851, p. 107). The use of written sources is certainly not directly excluded by this, and probably the linguistic peculiarities, of which some of course exist in isolated sections of our work, may be referred to this. But as these peculiarities consist chiefly of ἅπαξ λεγομένα, which may rather be ascribed to the richness of the author's vocabulary than to his talent for compilation, and in comparison with the great majority of points of agreement almost disappear, we must from the first be prepossessed against the theory that our author made use of written sources, and only allow ourselves to be moved to such a conclusion by further distinct phenomena in the various parts of our book, especially as the prologue of the Gospel, so often quoted for the purpose, does not at all support it. But in any case, as has already been remarked, *the* opinion that in the Acts of the Apostles the several parts are strung together almost without alteration, is quite irreconcilable with the result of our linguistic examination. Zeller rightly says: 'Were the author so dependent a compiler, the traces of such a proceeding must necessarily become apparent in thorough dissimilarity of language and expression. And this dissimilarity would be all the greater if his sources, as in that case we could scarcely help admitting, belonged to widely separated spheres as regards language and mode of thought. On the other hand, it would be altogether inexplicable that, in all parts of the work, the same favourite expressions, the same turns, the same peculiarities of vocabulary and syntax, should meet us. This phenomenon only becomes conceivable when we suppose that the contents of our work were brought into their present form by one and the same person, and that the work as it lies before us was not merely *compiled* by some one, but was also *composed* by him.'"[1]

Should an attempt be made to argue that, even if it be conceded that the language is that of the author of Acts, the sentiments may be those actually expressed by Stephen, it would at once be obvious that such an explanation is not only purely arbitrary and incapable of proof, but opposed to the facts of the case. It is not the language only which can be traced to the author of the rest of the Acts, but, as we have shown, the whole plan of the speech is the same as that of others in different parts of the work.

[1] Lekebusch, *Die Comp. und Entsteh. der Apostelgesch.*, p. 79 f.

Stephen speaks exactly as Peter does before him and Paul at a later period. There is just that amount of variety which a writer of not unlimited resources can introduce to express the views of different men under different circumstances; but there is so much which is nevertheless common to them all that community of authorship cannot be denied. On the other hand, the improbabilities of the narrative, the singular fact that Stephen is not mentioned by the Apostle Paul, and the peculiarities which may be detected in the speech itself, receive their very simple explanation when linguistic analysis so clearly demonstrates that the speech actually ascribed to the martyr Stephen is nothing more than a later composition put into his mouth by the author of the Acts.

CHAPTER VI.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK (CONTINUED): PHILIP AND THE EUNUCH. PETER AND CORNELIUS.

We have been forced to enter at such length into the discussion of the speech and martyrdom of Stephen that we cannot afford space to do more than merely glance at the proceedings of his colleague Philip, as we pass on to more important points in the work before us. The author states that a great persecution broke out at the time of Stephen's death, and that all (πάντες) the community of Jerusalem were scattered abroad "except the Apostles" (πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων). That the heads of the Church, who were well known, should remain unmolested in Jerusalem, whilst the whole of the less known members of the community were persecuted and driven to flight, is certainly an extraordinary and suspicious statement. Even Apologists are obliged to admit that the account of the dispersion of the whole Church is hyperbolic; but exaggeration and myth enter so largely and persistently into the composition of the Acts of the Apostles that it is difficult, after any attentive scrutiny, seriously to treat the work as in any strict sense historical. It has been conjectured by some critics, as well in explanation of this statement as in connection with theories regarding the views of Stephen, that the persecution in question was limited to the Hellenistic community to which Stephen belonged, whilst the Apostles and others, who were known as faithful observers of the law and of the temple worship,[1] were not regarded as heretics by the orthodox Jews. The narrative in the Acts does not seem to support the view that the persecution was limited to the Hellenists; but beyond the fact vouched for by Paul, that about this time there was a persecution, we have no data whatever regarding that event.

Philip, it is said, went down to the city of Samaria, and "was preaching the Christ"[2] to them. As the statement that "the multitudes with one accord gave heed to the things spoken" to them by Philip is ascribed to the miracles which he performed there, we are unable to regard the narrative as historical, and still less so when we consider the supernatural agency by which his further proceedings are directed and aided. We need only remark that the Samaritans, although only partly

[1] iii. 1, 11, iv. 1, v. 25.

[2] viii. 5.....ἐκήρυσσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Χριστόν.

of Jewish origin, and rejecting the Jewish Scriptures with the exception of the Pentateuch, worshipped the same God as the Jews, were circumcised, and were equally prepared as a nation to accept the Messiah. The statement that the Apostles Peter and John went to Samaria, in order, by the imposition of hands, to bestow the gift of the Holy Spirit to the converts baptised by Philip, does not add to the general credibility of the history. As Bleek[1] has well remarked, nothing is known or said as to whether the conversion of the Samaritans effected any change in their relations towards the Jewish people and the temple in Jerusalem. The mission of Philip to the Samaritans, as related in the Acts, cannot in any case be considered as having an important bearing on the question before us. We shall not discuss the episode of Simon at all, although, in the opinion of eminent critics, it contains much that is suggestive of the true character of the Acts of the Apostles. An "Angel of the Lord" (ἄγγελος κυρίου) speaks to Philip, and desires him to go to the desert way from Jerusalem to Gaza,[2] where the Spirit tells him[3] to draw near and join himself to the chariot of a man of Ethiopia who had come to worship at Jerusalem, and was then returning home. Philip runs thither, and, hearing him read Isaiah, expounds the passage to him, and at his own request the Eunuch is at once baptised. "And when they came up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away (πνεῦμα κυρίου ἥρπασε) Philip, and the Eunuch saw him no more; for he went on his way rejoicing; but Philip was found at Azotus."[4]

Attempts have, of course, been made to explain naturally the supernatural features of this narrative. Ewald, who is master of the art of rationalistic explanation, says with regard to the order given by the angel: "he felt impelled as by the power and the clear voice of an angel" to go in that direction; and the final miracle is disposed of by a contrast of the disinterestedness of Philip with the conduct of Gehazi, the servant of Elisha: it was the desire to avoid reward "which led him all the more hurriedly to leave his new convert"; "and it was as though the Spirit of the Lord himself snatched him from him another way," etc. "From Gaza Philip repaired rapidly northward to Ashdod, etc."[5] The great mass of critics reject such evasions, and recognise that the author relates miraculous occurrences. The introduction of supernatural agency in this way, however, removes the story from the region of history. Such statements are antecedently and, indeed, coming from an unknown writer and without

[1] *Hebräerbr.*, i., p. 57, anm. 72. [2] viii. 26. [3] v 29.
[4] v. 39 f. Azotus was upwards of thirty miles off.
[5] *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. 219, 220.

corroboration, absolutely incredible, and no means exist of ascertaining what original tradition may have assumed this mythical character. Zeller supposes that only the personality and nationality of the Eunuch are really historical.[1] All that need here be added is, that the great majority of critics agree that the Ethiopian was probably at least a Proselyte of the Gate, as his going to Jerusalem to worship seems clearly to indicate.[2] In any case, the mythical elements of this story, as well as the insufficiency of the details, deprive the narrative of historical value.[3]

The episodes of Stephen's speech and martyrdom and the mission of Philip are, in one respect especially, unimportant for the inquiry on which we are now more immediately engaged. They are almost completely isolated from the rest of the Acts; that is to say, no reference is subsequently made to them as forming any precedent for the guidance of the Church in the burning question which soon arose within it. Peter, as we shall see, when called upon to visit and baptise Cornelius, exhibits no recollection of his own mission to the Samaritans, and no knowledge of the conversion of the Ethiopian. Moreover, as Stephen plays so small a part in the history, and Philip does not reappear upon the scene after this short episode, no opportunity is afforded of comparing one part of their history with the rest. In passing on to the account of the baptism of Cornelius, we have at least the advantage of contrasting the action attributed to Peter with his conduct on earlier and later occasions, and a test is thus supplied which is of no small value for ascertaining the truth of the whole representation. To this narrative we must now address ourselves.

As an introduction to the important events at Cæsarea, the author of the Acts relates the particulars of a visit which Peter pays to Lydda and Joppa, in the course of which he performs two very remarkable miracles. At the former town he finds a certain man, named Æneas, paralysed, who had lain on a bed for eight years. Peter said to him: "Æneas, Jesus the Christ healeth thee: arise and make thy bed." And he rose immediately.[4] As the consequence of this miracle, the writer states that "All who dwelt at Lydda and the Sharon saw him, who turned to the Lord."[5] The exaggeration of such a statement is too palpable to

[1] *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 176. Cf. Holtzmann, *Bunsen's Bibelwork*, viii. 339.

[2] Some critics doubt whether the term εὐνοῦχος does not indicate merely an official position. Zeller, *Apg.*, p. 176, anm. 1; Milman, *Hist. of Chr.*, i., p. 367, note. Humphrey maintains that it does so here, Acts, p. 76.

[3] viii. 37 of the authorised version, which is omitted by Codices A, B, C, H, ℵ, and many others, and of course omitted as spurious by most editors, is an example of the way in which dogmas become antedated.

[4] ix. 33, 34. [5] ix. 35.

require argument. The effect produced by the supposed miracle is almost as incredible as the miracle itself, and the account altogether has little claim to the character of sober history.

This mighty work is altogether eclipsed by a miracle which Peter performs about the same time at Joppa. A certain woman, a disciple, named Tabitha, who was "full of good works," fell sick in those days and died, and when they washed her they laid her in an upper chamber, and sent to Peter at Lydda, beseeching him to come to them without delay. When Peter arrived they took him into the upper chamber, where all the widows stood weeping, and showed coats and garments which Dorcas used to make while she was with them. "But Peter put put them all out, and kneeled down and prayed; and, turning to the body, said: Tabitha, arise. And she opened her eyes, and when she saw Peter she sat up. And he gave her his hand, and raised her up, and when he called the saints and the widows he presented her alive." Apparently, the raising of the dead did not produce as much effect as the cure of the paralytic, for the writer only adds here: "And it was known throughout all Joppa; and many believed in the Lord."[1] We shall hereafter have to speak of the perfect calmness and absence of surprise with which these early writers relate the most astonishing miracles. It is evident from the manner in which this story is narrated that the miracle was anticipated. The ὑμερῷον in which the body is laid cannot have been the room generally used for that purpose, but is probably the single upper chamber of such a house which the author represents as specially adopted in anticipation of Peter's arrival. The widows who stand by weeping and showing the garments made by the deceased complete the preparation. As Peter is sent for after Dorcas had died, it would seem as though the writer intimated that her friends expected him to raise her from the dead. The explanation of this singular phenomenon, however, becomes clear when it is remarked that the account of this great miracle is closely traced from that of the raising of Jairus' daughter in the Synoptics,[2] and more especially in the second Gospel. In that instance Jesus is sent for; and, on coming to the house, he finds people "weeping and wailing greatly." He puts them all forth, like Peter; and, taking the child by the hand, says to her: "'Talitha koum,' which is, being interpreted, Maiden, I say unto thee, arise. And immediately the maiden arose and walked."[3]

[1] ix. 36–42.

[2] Matt. ix. 18, 19, 23–25; Mark v. 22, 23, 35–42; Luke viii. 41, 42, 49–56.

[3] Mark v. 38–42.

Baur and others[1] conjecture that even the name "Tabitha, which by interpretation is called Dorcas," was suggested by the words Ταλιθὰ κούμ, above quoted. The Hebrew original of Ταβιθά signifies "Gazelle," and they contend that it was used, like Ταλιθά, in the sense generally of: Maiden.' These two astonishing miracles, reported by an unknown writer, and without any corroboration, are absolutely incredible, and cannot prepossess any reasonable mind with confidence in the narrative to which they form an introduction; and the natural distrust which they awaken is fully confirmed when we find supernatural agency employed at every stage of the following history.

We are told[2] that a certain devout centurion, named Cornelius, "saw in a vision plainly" (εἶδεν ἐν �ράματι φανερῶς) an angel of God, who said to him: "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God. And now send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, who is surnamed Peter, whose house is by the seaside." After giving these minute directions, the angel departed, and Cornelius sent three messengers to Joppa. Just as they approached the end of their journey on the morrow, Peter went up to the housetop to pray about the sixth hour, the usual time of prayer among the Jews. He became very hungry, and while his meal was being prepared he fell into a trance and saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending as it had been a great sheet let down by four corners, in which were all four-footed beasts and creeping things of the earth and birds of the air. "And there came a voice to him: Rise, Peter; kill and eat. But

[1] In Mark. v. 41, Ταλιθὰ κούμ, ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον· τὸ κοράσιον.....In Acts ix. 36, Ταβιθά, ἡ διερμηνευομένη λέγεται Δορκάς.

[2] The leading peculiarities of the two accounts may be contrasted thus: –

Acts ix. 36.....τις ἦν μαθήτρια ὀνόματι Ταβιθά, ἡ διερμηνευομένη λέγεται Δορκάς. 38.....ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Π. ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῇ (Λύδδ.). ἀπέστειλαν δύο ἄνδρας πρὸς αὐτὸν παρακαλοῦντες· Μὴ ὀκνήσῃς διελθεῖν ἕως ἡμῶν. 39.....πᾶσαι αἱ χῆραι κλαίουσαι καὶ.....40. ἐκβαλὼν δὲ ἔξω πάντας ὁ Π.....καὶ ἐπιστρέψας πρὸς τὸ σῶμα εἶπεν· Ταβιθὰ ἀνάστηθι. ἡ δὲ.....ἀνεκάθισεν. 41. δοὺς δὲ αὐτῇ χεῖρα ἀνέστησεν αὐτήν.

Luke viii. 41. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ..... παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. 52. ἔκλαιον δὲ πάντες καὶ.....54. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας ἔξω*, καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, ἐφώνησεν λέγων· Ἡ παῖς, ἐγείρου. 55. καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρῆμα.

Mark v. 40.....αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας.....εἰσπορεύεται.....41. καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου λέγει αὐτῇ, Ταλιθὰ κούμ, ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον· Τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε. 42. καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέστη τὸ κορ. κ. τ. λ.

* Although this is the reading of the Cod. A (and C, except the ἔξω) and others, it is omitted by other ancient MSS.

[3] x. 1 f.

Peter said: Not so, Lord; for I never ate anything common or unclean. And the voice came unto him again a second time: What God cleansed call not thou common. This was done thrice: and straightway the vessel was taken up into heaven." While Peter "was doubting in himself" what the vision which he had seen meant, the men sent by Cornelius arrived, and "the Spirit said unto him: Behold men are seeking thee; but arise and get thee down and go with them doubting nothing, for I have sent them." Peter went with them on the morrow, accompanied by some of the brethren, and Cornelius was waiting for them with his kinsmen and near friends whom he had called together for the purpose. "And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell at his feet and worshipped. But Peter took him up, saying: Arise; I myself also am a man."[1] Going in, he finds many persons assembled, to whom he said: "Ye know how it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company with or come unto one of another nation; and yet God showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean. Therefore, also I came without gainsaying when sent for. I ask, therefore, for what reason ye sent for me?" Cornelius narrates the particulars of his vision, and continues: "Now, therefore, we are all present before God to hear all the things that have been commanded thee of the Lord. Then Peter opened his mouth and said: Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to him," and so on. While Peter is speaking, "the Holy Spirit fell on all those who heard the word. And they of the circumcision who believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also has been poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit; for they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God. Then answered Peter: Can anyone forbid the water that these should not be baptised, which have received the Holy Spirit as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptised in the name of the Lord."

We shall not waste time discussing the endeavours of Kuinoel, Neander, Lange, Ewald, and others, to explain away as much as possible the supernatural elements of this narrative, for their attempts are repudiated by most Apologists, and the miraculous phenomena are too clearly described and too closely connected with the course of the story to be either ignored or eliminated. Can such a narrative, heralded by such miracles as the instantaneous cure of the paralytic Æneas, and the raising from the dead of the maiden Dorcas, be regarded as sober history? Of course, many maintain that it can, and comparatively few have declared

[1] x. 26; cf. xiv. 14, 15.

themselves against this. We have, however, merely the narrative of an unknown author to set against unvarying experience, and that cannot much avail. We must now endeavour to discover how far this episode is consistent with the rest of the facts narrated in this book itself, and with such trustworthy evidence as we can elsewhere bring to bear upon it. We have already in an earlier part of our inquiry pointed out that, in the process of exhibiting a general parallelism between the Apostles Peter and Paul, a very close *pendant* to this narrative has been introduced by the author into the history of Paul. In the story of the conversion of Paul, the Apostle has his vision on the way to Damascus,[1] and about the same time the Lord in a vision desires Ananias ("a devout man, according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews that dwell" in Damascus),[2] "arise, and go to the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one named Saul of Tarsus; for behold he prayeth, and saw in a vision a man named Ananias coming in and putting his hand on him that he might receive sight." On this occasion also the gift of the Holy Spirit is conferred, and Saul is baptised.[3] Whilst such miraculous agency is so rare elsewhere, it is so common in the Acts of the Apostles that the employment of visions and of angels, under every circumstance, is one of the characteristics of the author, and may therefore be set down to his own imagination.

No one who examines this episode of Cornelius attentively, we think, can doubt that the narrative before us is composed in apologetic interest, and is designed to have a special bearing upon the problem as to the relation of the Pauline Gospel to the preaching of the Twelve. Baur[4] has acutely pointed out the significance of the very place assigned to it in the general history, and its insertion immediately after the conversion of Paul, and before the commencement of his ministry, as a legitimation of his Apostleship of the Gentiles. One point stands clearly out of the strange medley of Jewish prejudice, Christian liberalism, and supernatural interference which constitute the elements of the story: the actual conviction of Peter regarding the relation of the Jew to the Gentile, that the Gospel is addressed to the former and that the Gentile is excluded, which has to be removed by a direct supernatural revelation from heaven. The author recognises that this was the general view of the primitive Church, and this is the only particular in which we can perceive historical truth in the narrative. The complicated machinery of visions and angelic messengers is used to justify the abandonment of Jewish restric-

[1] ix. 3 f. [2] xxii. 12; cf. x. 1 f., 22. [3] ix. 10–18.

[4] Baur, *Paulus*, i., p. 90; Schneckenburger, *Zweck d. Apostelgesch.*, p. 170 f.

tions, which was preached by Paul amidst so much virulent opposition. Peter anticipates and justifies Paul in his ministry of the uncircumcision, and the overthrow of Mosaic barriers has the sanction and seal of a divine command. We have to see whether the history itself does not betray its mythical character, not only in its supernatural elements, but in its inconsistency with other known or narrated incidents in the Apostolical narrative.

There has been much difference of opinion as to whether the centurion Cornelius had joined himself in any recognised degree to the Jewish religion before this incident, and a majority of critics maintain that he is represented as a Proselyte of the Gate. The terms in which he is described, x. 2, as εὐσεβὴς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν, certainly seem to indicate this, and probably the point would not have been questioned but for the fact that the writer evidently intends to deal with the subject of Gentile conversion, with which the representation that Cornelius was already a proselyte would somewhat clash. Whether a proselyte or not, the Roman centurion is said to be "devout and fearing God with all his house, giving much alms to the people, and praying to God always";[1] and probably the ambiguity as to whether he had actually become affiliated in any way to Mosaism is intentional. When Peter, however, with his scruples removed by the supernatural communication with which he had just been favoured, indicates their previous strength by the statement: "Ye know how it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company with or come unto one of another nation,"[2] the author evidently oversteps the mark, and betrays the unhistorical nature of the narrative; for such an affirmation not only could not have been made by Peter, but could only have been advanced by a writer who was himself a Gentile, and writing at a distance from the events described. There is no injunction of the Mosaic law declaring such intercourse unlawful,[3] nor indeed is such a rule elsewhere heard of, and even Apologists who refer to the point have no show of authority by which to support such a statement. Not only was there no legal prohibition, but it is impossible to conceive that there was any such exclusiveness practised by traditional injunction.[4] As de Wette appropriately remarks, moreover, even if such a prohibition existed as regards idolaters, it would still be inconceivable how it could apply to Cornelius,

[1] x. 2, cf. 22. [2] x. 28.

[3] Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii., p. 242; Overbeck, *zu de Wette, Apg.*, p. 159; de Wette, *Apg.*, p. 158; Zeller, *Apg.*, p. 187.

[4] De Wette quotes against it *Schemoth Rabba*, § 19 f., 118. 3. ad Exod. xii. 2: "*Hoc idem est, quod scriptum dicit Jes. lvi. 3: Et non dicet filius advenæ, qui adhæsit Domino, dicendo: separando separavit me Dominus a populo suo*" (*Apostelgesch.*, p. 158).

"a righteous man and fearing God, and of good report among all the nation of the Jews."[1] It is also inconsistent with the zeal for proselytism displayed by the Pharisees,[2] the strictest sect of the Jews; and the account given by Josephus of the conversion of Izates of Adiabene is totally against it.[3]

There is a slight trait which, added to others, tends to complete the demonstration of the unhistorical character of this representation. Peter is said to have lived many days in Joppa with one Simon, a tanner, and it is in his house that the messengers of Cornelius find him.[4] Now, the tanner's trade was considered impure amongst the Jews,[5] and it was almost pollution to live in Simon's house. It is argued by some commentators that the fact that Peter lodged there is mentioned to show that he had already emancipated himself from Jewish prejudices. However this may be, it is strangely inconsistent that a Jew who has no objection to live with a tanner should, at the same time, consider it unlawful to hold intercourse of any kind with a pious Gentile, who, if not actually a Proselyte of the Gate, had every qualification for becoming one. This indifference to the unclean and polluting trade of the tanner, moreover, is inconsistent with the reply which Peter gives to the voice which bids him slay and eat: "Not so, Lord, for I never ate anything common or unclean." No doubt the intercourse to which Peter refers indicates, or at least includes, eating and drinking with one of another country, and this alone could present any intelligible difficulty, for the mere transaction of business or conversation with strangers must have been daily necessary to the Jews. It must be remarked, however, that, when Peter makes the statement which we are discussing, nothing whatever is said of eating with the Centurion or sitting with him at table. This leads to a striking train of reflection upon the whole episode.

It is a curious thing that the supernatural vision, which is designed to inform Peter and the Apostles that the Gentiles might be received into the Church, should take the form of a mere intimation that the distinction of clean and unclean animals was no longer binding, and that he might indifferently kill and eat. One might have thought that, on the supposition that Heaven desired to give Peter and the Church a command to admit the Gentiles unconditionally to the benefits of the Gospel, this would be simply and clearly stated. This was not done at all, and the intimation by which Peter supposes himself justified in considering it lawful

[1] x. 22; de Wette, *Apg.*, p. 158.
[2] Matt. xxiii. 15.
[3] *Antiq.*, xx. 2, 3.
[4] ix. 43, x. 6.
[5] Schoettgen, *Horæ Hebr.*, p. 447; Alford, *Greek Test.*, ii., p. 109; Hackett, *Acts*, p. 144; Meyer, *Apg.*, p. 235; Renan, *Les Apôtres*, p. 199; de Wette, *Apg.*, p. 150; Wordsworth, *Greek Test.*, Acts, p. 88.

to go to Cornelius is, in the first place, merely on the subject of animals defined as clean and unclean. Doubtless the prohibition as to certain meats might tend to continue the separation between Jew and Gentile, and the disregard of such distinctions of course promoted general intercourse with strangers; but this by no means explains why the abrogation of this distinction is made the intimation to receive Gentiles into the Church. When Peter returns to Jerusalem we are told that "they of the circumcision" —that is to say, the whole Church there, since at that period all were "of the circumcision," and this phrase further indicates that the writer has no historical standpoint contended with him. The subject of the contention, we might suppose, was the baptism of Gentiles; but not so: the charge brought against him was: "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them."[1] The subject of Paul's dispute with Peter at Antioch simply was that, "before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they came he withdrew, fearing them of the circumcision."[2] That the whole of these passages should turn merely on the fact of eating with men who were uncircumcised is very suggestive, and as the Church at Jerusalem make no allusion to the baptism of uncircumcised Gentiles, it would lead to the inference that nothing was known of such an event, and that the circumstance was simply added to some other narrative; and this is rendered all the more probable by the fact that, in the affair at Antioch as well as throughout the Epistle to the Galatians, Peter is very far from acting as one who had been the first to receive uncircumcised Gentiles freely into the Church.

It is usually asserted that the vision of Peter abrogated the distinction of clean and unclean animals so long existing in the Mosaic Law, but there is no evidence that any subsequent gradual abandonment of the rule was ascribed to such a command; and it is remarkable that Peter himself not only does not, as we shall presently see, refer to this vision as authority for disregarding the distinction of clean and unclean meats, and for otherwise considering nothing common or unclean, but acts as if such a vision had never taken place. The famous decree of the Council of Jerusalem, moreover, makes no allusion to any modification of the Mosaic law in the case of Jewish Christians, whatever relaxation it may seem to grant to Gentile converts, and there is no external evidence of any kind that so important an abolition of ancient legal prescriptions was thus introduced into Christendom.

We have, however, fortunately one test of the historical value of this whole episode, to which we have already briefly referred, but which we must now more closely apply. Paul himself, in his

[1] xi. 3. [2] Gal. ii. 12.

Epistle to the Galatians, narrates the particulars of a scene between himself and Peter at Antioch, of which no mention is made in the Acts of the Apostles, and we think that no one can fairly consider that episode without being convinced that it is utterly irreconcilable with the supposition that the vision which we are now examining can ever have appeared to Peter, or that he can have played the part attributed to him in the conversion and baptism of uncircumcised Gentiles. Paul writes: "But when Cephas came to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was condemned. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles, and when they came he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them of the circumcision; and the other Jews also joined in his hypocrisy."[1] It will be remembered that, in the case of Cornelius, "they of the circumcision" in Jerusalem, at the head of whom was James, from whom came those "of the circumcision" of whom Peter was afraid at Antioch, contended with Peter for going in "to men uncircumcised and eating with them,"[2] the very thing which was in question at Antioch. In the Acts, Peter is represented as defending his conduct by relating the divine vision under the guidance of which he acted, and the author states as the result that "When they heard these things they held their peace and glorified God, saying: Then to the Gentiles also God gave repentance unto life."[3] This is the representation of the author of the vision and of the conversion of Cornelius, but very different is Peter's conduct as described by the Apostle Paul, very dissimilar the phenomena presented by a narrative upon which we can rely. The "certain who came from James" can never have heard of the direct communication from Heaven which justified Peter's conduct, and can never have glorified God in the manner described, or Peter could not have had any reason to fear them; for a mere reference to his vision, and to the sanction of the Church of Jerusalem, must have been sufficient to reconcile them to his freedom. Then, is it conceivable that after such a vision, and after being taught by God himself not to call any man or thing common or unclean, Peter could have acted as he did for fear of them of the circumcision? His conduct is convincing evidence that he knew as little of any such vision as those who came from James. On the other hand, if we require further proof it is furnished by the Apostle Paul himself. Is it conceivable that, if such an episode had ever really occurred, the Apostle Paul would not have referred to it upon this occasion? What more appropriate argument could he have used, what more legitimate rebuke could he have administered, than merely to have reminded Peter of his own vision? He both rebukes him and argues, but

[1] Gal. ii. 11–13. [2] Acts xi. 2, 3. [3] *Ib.*, xi. 18.

his rebuke and his argument have quite a different complexion; and we confidently affirm that no one can read that portion of the Epistle to the Galatians without feeling certain that, had the writer been aware of such a divine communication -- and we think it must be conceded without question that, if it had taken place, he must have been aware of it[1] he would have referred to so direct and important an authority. Neither here nor in the numerous places where such an argument would have been so useful to the Apostle does Paul betray the slightest knowledge of the episode of Cornelius. The historic occurrence at Antioch, so completely ignored by the author of the Acts, totally excludes the mythical story of Cornelius.

There are merely one or two other points in connection with the episode to which we must call attention. In his address to Cornelius, Peter says: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons" (*οὐκ ἔστιν προσωποληπτης ὁ θεός*). Now this is not only a thoroughly Pauline sentiment, but Paul has more than once made use of precisely the same expression. Rom. ii. 11: "For there is no respect of persons with God" (*οὐ γάρ ἐστιν προσωπολημψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ*); and, again, Gal. ii. 6: "God respecteth no man's person" (*πρόσωπον ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει*).[2] The author of the Acts was certainly acquainted with the Epistles of Paul, and the very manner in which he represents Peter as employing this expression betrays the application of a sentiment previously in his mind, "Of a truth I perceive," etc. The circumstance confirms what Paul had already said.[3] Then, in the defence of his conduct at Jerusalem, Peter is represented as saying: "And I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptised with water, but ye shall be baptised with the Holy Spirit."[4] Now these words are by all the Gospels put into the mouth of John the Baptist, and not of Jesus;[5] but the author of the Acts seems to put them into the mouth of Jesus at the beginning of the work,[6] and their repetition here is only an additional proof of the fact that the episode of Cornelius, as it stands before us, is not historical, but is merely his own composition.

The whole of this narrative, with its complicated series of miracles, is evidently composed to legitimate the free reception into the Christian Church of Gentile converts; and, to emphasize

[1] Indeed the reference to this case, supposed to be made by Peter himself, in Paul's presence, excludes the idea of ignorance, if the Acts be treated as historical.

[2] Cf. Ephes. vi. 9, Col. iii. 25.

[3] Compare further x. 35 f. with Rom. ii. iii., etc. The sentiments and even the words are Pauline.

[4] xi. 16.

[5] Matt. iii. 11, Mark i. 8, Luke iii. 16, John i. 26, 33.

[6] i. 5.

the importance of the divine ratification of their admission, Peter is made to repeat to the Church of Jerusalem the main incidents which had just been fully narrated. On the one hand, the previous Jewish exclusiveness both of Peter and of the Church is displayed first, in the resistance of the Apostle, which can only be overcome by the vision and the direct order of the Holy Spirit, and by the manifest outpouring of the Spirit upon the Centurion and his household; and, second, in the contention of the party of the circumcision, which is only overcome by an account of the repeated signs of divine purpose and approval. The universality of the Gospel could not be more broadly proclaimed than in the address of Peter to Cornelius. Not the Jews alone, "but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to him." Pauline principles are thus anticipated, and, as we have pointed out, are expressed almost in the words of the Apostle of the Gentiles. The Jews who go with Peter were astonished because that on the Gentiles also had been poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit;[1] and the Church of Jerusalem, on hearing of these things, glorified God that repentance unto life had been given to the Gentiles. It is impossible that the admission of the Gentiles to the privileges of the Church could be more prominently signified than by this episode, introduced by prodigious miracles and effected by supernatural machinery. Where, however, are the consequences of this marvellous recognition of the Gentiles? It does not in the slightest degree preclude the necessity for the Council, which we shall presently consider; it does not apparently exercise any influence on James and the Church of Jerusalem; Peter, indeed, refers vaguely to it, but as a matter out of date and almost forgotten; Paul, in all his disputes with the emissaries of the Church of Jerusalem, in all his pleas for the freedom of his Gentile converts, never makes the slightest allusion to it; it remains elsewhere unknown, and, so far as any evidence goes, utterly without influence upon the primitive Church. This will presently become more apparent; but already it is clear enough to those who will exercise calm reason that it is impossible to consider this narrative, with its tissue of fruitless miracles, as a historical account of the development of the Church.

[1] x. 45 f.

CHAPTER VII.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK (CONTINUED): PAUL THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES

We have now arrived at the point in our examination of the Acts in which we have the inestimable advantage of being able to compare the narrative of the unknown author with the distinct statements of the Apostle Paul. In doing so, we must remember that the author must have been acquainted with the Epistles which are now before us, and, supposing it to be his purpose to present a peculiar view of the transactions in question, whether for apologetic or for conciliatory reasons, it is obvious that it would not be reasonable to expect divergencies of so palpable a nature that any reader of the letters must at once perceive them. When the Acts were written, it is true, the author could not have known that the Epistles of Paul were to attain the high canonical position which they now occupy, and might, therefore, use his materials more freely; still, it would be natural to expect a certain superficial consistency. Unfortunately, our means of testing the statements of the author are not so minute as is desirable, although they are often of much value; and, seeing the great facility with which, by apparently slight alterations and omissions, a different complexion can be given to circumstances regarding which no very full details exist elsewhere, we must be prepared to seize every indication which may enable us to form a just estimate of the nature of the writing which we are examining.

In the first two chapters of his Epistle to the Galatians, the Apostle Paul relates particulars regarding some important epochs of his life, which likewise enter into the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles. The Apostle gives an account of his own proceedings immediately after his conversion, and of the visit which about that time he paid to Jerusalem; and, further, of a second visit to Jerusalem fourteen years later; and to these we must now direct our attention. We defer consideration of the narrative of the actual conversion of Paul for the present, and merely intend here to discuss the movements and conduct of the Apostle immediately subsequent to that event. The Acts of the Apostles represent Paul as making five journeys to Jerusalem subsequent to his joining the Christian body. The first, ix. 26 f., takes place immediately after his conversion; the second, xi. 30, xii. 25, is upon an occasion when the Church at Antioch are represented as sending relief to

the brethren of Judæa by the hands of Barnabas and Saul, during a time of famine; the third visit to Jerusalem, xv. 1 f., Paul likewise pays in company with Barnabas, both being sent by the Church of Antioch to confer with the Apostles and Elders as to the necessity of circumcision, and the obligation of Gentile converts to observe the Mosaic law; the fourth, xviii. 21 f., when he goes to Ephesus with Priscilla and Aquilla, "having shaved his head in Cenchrea, for he had a vow"; and the fifth and last, xxi. 15 f., when the disturbance took place in the temple which led to his arrest and journey to Rome. The circumstances and general character of these visits to Jerusalem, and more especially of that on which the momentous conference is described as having taken place, are stated with so much precision, and they present features of such marked difference, that it might have been supposed there could not have been any difficulty in identifying with certainty, at least, the visits to which the Apostle refers in his letter, more especially as upon both occasions he mentions important particulars which characterised them. It is a remarkable fact, however, that the divergencies between the statements of the unknown author and the Apostle are so marked that upon no point has there been more decided difference of opinion amongst critics and divines from the very earliest times. Upon general grounds, we have already seen, there has been good reason to doubt the historical character of the Acts. Is it not a singularly suggestive circumstance that, when it is possible to compare the authentic representations of Paul with the narrative of the Acts, even Apologists perceive so much opening for doubt and controversy?

The visit described in the ninth chapter of the Acts is generally identified with that which is mentioned in the first chapter of the Epistle. This unanimity arises mainly from the circumstance that both writers clearly represent that visit as the first which Paul paid to Jerusalem after his conversion, for the details of the two narratives are anything but in agreement with each other. Although critics are forced to agree as to the bare identity of the visit, this harmony is immediately disturbed on examining the two accounts, and, whilst the one party find the statements in the Acts reconcilable with those of Paul, a large body more or less distinctly declare them to be contradictory and unhistorical. In order that the question at issue may be fairly laid before the reader, we shall give the two accounts in parallel columns:—

Acts ix. 19 f.	Ep. to Gal. i. 15 f.
19. And he was certain days (*ἡμέρας τινάς*) with the disciples in Damascus.	15. But when it pleased God.....
20. And immediately (*εὐθέως*) was	16. To reveal his son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles;

Acts ix. 19 f.	Ep. to Gal. i. 15 f.
preaching Jesus in the synagogues, etc.	immediately (εὐθέως) I conferred not with flesh and blood;
21. And all that heard him were amazed, saying, etc.	17. Neither went I up to Jerusalem to those who were Apostles before me;
22. But Saul was increasing in strength more and more, and confounding the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is the Christ.	but I went away into Arabia, and returned again into Damascus.
23. And after many days (ἡμέραι ἱκαναί) were fulfilled, the Jews took counsel to kill him; 24. But their plot was known to Saul. And they were even watching the gates day and night to kill him.	
25. But the disciples took him by night, and let him down through the wall in a basket.	
26. And when he came to Jerusalem he was assaying to join himself to the disciples; but all were afraid of him, not believing that he is a disciple.	18. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit[1] Cephas, and abode with him fifteen days.
27. But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the Apostles, and declared unto them how he saw the Lord in the way, and that he spake to him; and how he preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus.	19. But other of the Apostles saw I not save James the Lord's brother.
	20. Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not.
28. And he was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem, preaching boldly in the name of the Lord.	21. Thereafter I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia;
29. And he was speaking and disputing against the Grecian Jews; but they took counsel to slay him;	22. But I was unknown by face unto the churches of Judæa which were in Christ; but they were only hearing that he who formerly persecuted us is now preaching the faith which
30. But when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus.	once he was destroying: and they glorified God in me.

It is obvious that the representation in the Acts of what Paul did after his conversion differs very widely from the account which the Apostle himself gives of the matter. In the first place, not a word is said in the former of the journey into Arabia: but, on the contrary, it is excluded, and the statement which replaces it directly contradicts that of Paul. The Apostle says that after his conversion "Immediately[2] (εὐθέως) I conferred not with flesh and blood," but "went away into Arabia." The author of the Acts says that he spent "some days" (ἡμέρας τινάς) with the

[1] To become acquainted with.

[2] Dr. Ellicott remarks: "*Straightway*; the word standing prominently forward, and implying that he not only avoided conference with men, but did so from the *very first*" (*St. Paul's Ep. to the Gal.*, 4th ed., p. 16).

disciples in Damascus, and "immediately" (εὐθέως) began to preach in the synagogues. Paul's feelings are so completely misrepresented that, instead of that desire for retirement and solitude which his words express, he is described as straightway plunging into the vortex of public life in Damascus. The general apologetic explanation is, that the author of the Acts either was not aware of the journey into Arabia, or that, his absence there having been short, he did not consider it necessary to mention it. There are no data for estimating the length of time which Paul spent in Arabia, but the fact that the Apostle mentions it with so much emphasis proves not only that he attached considerable weight to the episode, but that the duration of his visit could not have been unimportant. In any case, the author of the Acts, whether ignorantly or not, boldly describes the Apostle as doing precisely what he did not. To any ordinary reader, moreover, his whole account of Paul's preaching at Damascus certainly excludes altogether the idea of such a journey, and the argument that it can be inserted anywhere is purely arbitrary. There are many theories amongst Apologists as to the part of the narrative in Acts in which the Arabian journey can be placed. By some it is assigned to a period before he commenced his active labours, and therefore before ix. 20, from which the words of the author repulse it with singular clearness; others intercalate it with even less reason between ix. 20 and 21; a few discover some indication of it in the μᾶλλον ἐνεδυναμοῦτο of verse 22—an expression, however, which refuses to be forced into such service; a greater number place it in the ἡμέραι ἱκαναί of verse 23, making that elastic phrase embrace this as well as other difficulties till it snaps under the strain. It seems evident to an unprejudiced reader that the ἡμέραι ἱκαναί are represented as passed in Damascus. And, lastly, some critics place it after ix. 25, regardless of Paul's statement that from Arabia he returned again to Damascus, which, under the circumstances mentioned in Acts, he was not likely to do, and indeed it is obvious that he is there supposed to have at once gone from Damascus to Jerusalem. These attempts at reconciliation are useless. It is of no avail to find time into which a journey to Arabia and the stay there might be forcibly thrust. There still remains the fact that, so far from the Arabian visit being indicated in the Acts, the εὐθέως of ix. 20, compared with the εὐθέως of Gal. i. 16, positively excludes it, and proves that the narrative of the former is not historical.

There is another point in the account in Acts which further demands attention. The impression conveyed by the narrative is that Paul went up to Jerusalem not very long after his conversion. The omission of the visit to Arabia shortens the interval before he

did so, by removing causes of delay; and, whilst no expressions are used which imply a protracted stay in Damascus, incidents are introduced which indicate that the purpose of the writer was to represent the Apostle as losing no time after his conversion before associating himself with the elder Apostles and obtaining their recognition of his ministry; and this view, we shall see, is confirmed by the peculiar account which is given of what took place at Jerusalem. The Apostle distinctly states, i. 18, that three years after his conversion he went up to visit Peter.[1] In the Acts he is represented as spending "some days" (ἡμέρας τινάς) with the disciples, and the only other chronological indication given is that, after "many days" (ἡμέραι ἱκαναί), the plot occurred which forced him to leave Damascus. It is argued that ἡμέραι ἱκαναί is an indefinite period, which may, according to the usage of the author,[2] indicate a considerable space of time, and certainly rather express a long than a short period.[3] The fact is, however, that the instances cited are evidence, in themselves, against the supposition that the author can have had any intention of expressing a period of three years by the words ἡμέραι ἱκαναί. We suppose that no one has ever suggested that Peter stayed three years in the house of Simon the tanner at Joppa (ix. 43); or that when it is said that Paul remained "many days" at Corinth after the insurrection of the Jews, the author intends to speak of some years, when in fact the ἡμέραι ἱκαναί contrasted with the expression (xviii. 11), "he continued there a year and six months," used regarding his stay previous to that disturbance, evidently reduces the "yet many days" subsequently spent there to a very small compass. Again, has any one ever suggested that in the account of Paul's voyage to Rome, where it is said (xxvii. 7) that, after leaving Myrra "and sailing slowly many days" (ἡμέραι ἱκαναί), they had scarcely got so far as Cnidus, an interval of months, not to say years, is indicated? It is impossible to suppose that by such an expression the writer intended to indicate a period of three years.

That the narrative of the Acts actually represents Paul as going up to Jerusalem soon after his conversion, and certainly not merely at the end of three years, is obvious from the statement in verse 26, that when Paul arrived at Jerusalem, and was assaying to join himself to the disciples, all were afraid of him, and would not believe in his conversion. The author could certainly not have stated

[1] "The 'straightway' of verse 16 leads to this conclusion: '*At first* I conferred not with flesh and blood, it was only *after the lapse of three years* that I went to Jerusalem'" (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 83).

[2] Acts ix. 43, xviii 18, xvii. 7; Lightfoot, *ib.*, p. 89, note 3.

[3] "The difference between the vague 'many days' of the Acts and the definite 'three years' of the Epistle is such as might be expected from the circumstances of the two writers" (Lightfoot, *ib.*, p. 89, note 3).

this, if he had desired to imply that Paul had already been a Christian, and publicly preached with so much success at Damascus, for three years. Indeed, the statements in ix. 26 are irreconcilable with the declaration of the Apostle, whatever view be taken of the previous narrative of the Acts. If it be assumed that the author wishes to describe the visit to Jerusalem as taking place three years after his conversion, then the ignorance of that event amongst the brethren there and their distrust of Paul are utterly inconsistent and incredible; whilst if, on the other hand, he represents the Apostle as going to Jerusalem with but little delay in Damascus, as we contend he does, then there is no escape from the conclusion that the Acts, whilst thus giving a narrative consistent with itself, distinctly contradicts the deliberate assertions of the Apostle. It is absolutely incredible that the conversion of a well-known persecutor of the Church (viii. 3 f.), effected in a way which is represented as so sudden and supernatural, and accompanied by a supposed vision of the Lord, could for three years have remained unknown to the community of Jerusalem. So striking a triumph for Christianity must have been rapidly circulated throughout the Church, and the fact that he who formerly persecuted was now zealously preaching the faith which once he destroyed must long have been generally known in Jerusalem, which was in such constant communication with Damascus.

The author of the Acts continues in the same strain, stating that Barnabas, under the circumstances just described, took Paul and brought him to the Apostles (πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους), and declared to them the particulars of his vision and conversion, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus.[1] No doubt is left that this is the first intimation the Apostles had received of such extraordinary events. After this, we are told that Paul was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem, preaching boldly in the name of the Lord. Here again the declaration of Paul is explicit, and distinctly contradicts this story both in the letter and the spirit. He makes no mention of Barnabas. He states that he went to Jerusalem specially with the view of making the acquaintance of Peter, with whom he remained fifteen days; but he emphatically says: "But other of the Apostles saw I not, save (εἰ μή) James, the Lord's brother"; and then he adds the solemn declaration regarding his account of this visit: "Now the things which I write unto you behold, before God, I lie not." An asseveration made in this tone excludes the supposition of inaccuracy or careless vagueness, and the specific statements have all the force of sworn evidence. Instead of being presented "to the Apostles," therefore, and going in and out with them at Jerusalem,

[1] ix. 27.

we have here the emphatic assurance that, in addition to Peter, Paul saw no one except "James, the Lord's brother."

There has been much discussion as to the identity of this James, and whether he was an Apostle or not: but into this it is unnecessary for us to enter. Most writers agree at least that he is the same James, the head of the Church at Jerusalem, whom we again frequently meet with in the Pauline Epistles and in the Acts, and notably in the account of the Apostolic council. The exact interpretation to be put upon the expression εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον has also been the subject of great controversy, the question being whether James is here really called an Apostle or not; whether εἰ μὴ is to be understood as applying solely to the verb, in which case the statement would mean that he saw no other of the Apostles, but only James, or to the whole phrase, which would express that he had seen no other of the Apostles save James. It is admitted, by many of those who think that in this case the latter signification must be adopted, that grammatically either interpretation is permissible. Even supposing that, rightly or wrongly, James is here referred to as an Apostle, the statement of the Acts is, in spirit, quite opposed to that of the Epistle: for when we are told that Paul is brought "to the Apostles" (πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους), the linguistic usage of the writer implies that he means much more than merely Peter and James. It seems impossible to reconcile the statement, ix. 27, with the solemn assurance of Paul; and if we accept what the Apostle says as truth, and we cannot doubt it, it must be admitted that the account in the Acts is unhistorical.

We arrive at the very same conclusion on examining the rest of the narrative. In the Acts, Paul is represented as being with the Apostles going in and out, preaching openly in Jerusalem, and disputing with the Grecian Jews.[1] No limit is here put to his visit, and it is difficult to conceive that what is narrated is intended to describe a visit of merely fifteen days. A subsequent statement in the Acts, however, explains and settles the point. Paul is represented as declaring to King Agrippa, xxvi. 19 f.: "Wherefore, King Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision, but first unto those in Damascus, and throughout all the region of Judæa, and to the Gentiles, I was declaring that they should repent and turn to God," etc. However this may be, the statement of Paul does not admit the interpretation of such public ministry. His express purpose in going to Jerusalem was, not to preach, but to make the acquaintance of Peter; and it was a marked characteristic of Paul to avoid preaching in ground already occupied by the other Apostles before him.[2] Not only is the account in Acts

[1] ix. 28 f. [2] 2 Cor. x. 14 f.; cf. Rom. xv. 20.

apparently excluded by such considerations and by the general tenour of the Epistle, but it is equally so by the direct words of the Apostle (i. 22): "I was unknown by face unto the churches of Judæa." It is argued that the term, "churches of Judæa," excludes Jerusalem. It might possibly be asserted with reason that such an expression as "the churches of Jerusalem" might exclude the churches of Judæa, but to say that the Apostle, writing elsewhere to the Galatians of a visit to Jerusalem, and of his conduct at that time, intends, when speaking of the "churches of Judæa," to exclude the principal city seems to us arbitrary and unwarrantable. The whole object of the Apostle is to show the privacy of his visit and his independence of the elder Apostles. He does not use the expression as a contrast to Jerusalem. Nothing in his account leads one to think of any energetic preaching during the visit, and the necessity of finding some way of excluding Jerusalem from the Apostle's expression is simply thrust upon Apologists by the account in Acts. Two passages are referred to as supporting the exclusion of Jerusalem from "the churches of Judæa." In John iii. 22 we read: "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judæa." In the preceding chapter he is described as being at Jerusalem. We have already said enough about the geographical notices of the author of the fourth Gospel.[1] Even those who do not admit that he was not a native of Palestine are agreed that he wrote in another country and for foreigners. "The land of Judæa" was therefore a natural expression superseding the necessity of giving a more minute local indication which would have been of little use. The second instance appealed to, though more doubtfully,[2] is Heb. xiii. 24: "They from Italy salute you." We are at a loss to understand how this is supposed to support the interpretation adopted. It is impossible that if Paul went in and out with the Apostles, preached boldly in Jerusalem, and disputed with the Hellenistic Jews, not to speak of what is added, Acts xxvi. 19 f., he could say that he was unknown by face to the churches of Judæa. There is nothing, we may remark, which limits his preaching to the Grecian Jews. Whilst Apologists maintain that the two accounts are reconcilable, many of them frankly admit that the account in Acts requires correction from that in the Epistle;[3] but, on the other hand, a still greater number of critics pronounce the narrative in the Acts contradictory to the statements of Paul.

There remains another point upon which a few remarks must be made. In Acts ix. 29 f. the cause of Paul's hurriedly leaving

[1] See p. 528 f.

[2] Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 85.

[3] Bleek, *Einl.*, p. 364 f.; Ewald, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi., p. 403, anm. 1; *Sendschr. d. Ap. Paulus*, 1857, p. 68 f.; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 92; Neander, *Pflanzung*, p. 127 f.

Jerusalem is a plot of the Grecian Jews to kill him. Paul does not, in the Epistle, refer to any such matter; but, in another part of the Acts, Paul is represented as relating, xxii. 17 f.: "And it came to pass that, when I returned to Jerusalem and was praying in the temple, I was in a trance, and saw him saying unto me: Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem, for they will not receive thy witness concerning me," etc. This account differs, therefore, even from the previous narrative in the same book; yet critics are agreed that the visit during which the Apostle is said to have seen this vision was that which we are discussing. The writer is so little a historian working from substantial facts that he forgets the details of his own previous statements; and in the account of the conversion of Paul, for instance, he thrice repeats the story with emphatic and irreconcilable contradictions. We have already observed his partiality for visions, and such supernatural agency is so ordinary a matter with him that, in the first account of this visit, he altogether omits the vision, although he must have known of it then quite as much as on the second occasion. The Apostle, in his authentic and solemn account of this visit, gives no hint of any vision, and leaves no suggestion even of that public preaching which is described in the earlier, and referred to in the later, narrative in the Acts.[1] If we had no other grounds for rejecting the account as unhistorical, this miraculous vision, added as an afterthought, would have warranted our doing so.

Passing on now to the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, we find that Paul writes: "Then, after fourteen years, again I went up to Jerusalem....." (*ἔπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.....*). He states the particulars of what took place upon the occasion of this second visit with a degree of minuteness which ought, one might have supposed, to have left no doubt of its identity when compared with the same visit historically described elsewhere; but such are the discrepancies between the two accounts that, as we have already mentioned, the controversy upon the point has been long and active.[2] The

[1] Paley (*Horæ Paul.* v., No. viii.) actually endeavours to show the genuineness of the Epistle to the Galatians by the "undesigned coincidence" of the shortness of Paul's visit as stated by himself and the miraculous order reported Acts xxii. 17 f., "Get thee quickly out of Jerusalem." The fallacy, not to say unfairness, of this partial argument needs no demonstration, and, indeed, it has been well pointed out by Dr. Jowett (*The Epistles of St. Paul*, i., p. 350 f.).

[2] There was anything but unanimity on the point among the Fathers. Irenæus identified the second Galatian visit with the third of Acts (xv.). It is not certain whether Tertullian agreed in this (*Adv. M.*, v. 2, 3) or placed it later (*Adv. M.*, i. 20); Eusebius thought it the same as the second of Acts; Epiphanius identified it with the fifth of Acts (xxi. 15); Chrysostom places it

Acts, it will be remembered, relate a second visit of Paul to Jerusalem, after that which we have discussed, upon which occasion it is stated (xi. 30) that he was sent with Barnabas to convey to the community, during a time of famine, the contributions of the Church of Antioch. The third visit of the Acts is that (xv.) when Paul and Barnabas are said to have been deputed to confer with the Apostles regarding the conditions upon which Gentile converts should be admitted into the Christian brotherhood. The circumstances of this visit, more nearly than any other, correspond with those described by the Apostle himself in the Epistle (ii. 1 f.); but there are grave difficulties in the way of identifying them. If this visit be identical with that described Acts xv., and if Paul, as he states, paid no intermediate visit to Jerusalem, what becomes of the visit interpolated in Acts xi. 30?

The first point which we must endeavour to ascertain is what the Apostle actually intends to say regarding the second visit which he mentions. The purpose of Paul is to declare his complete independence from those who were Apostles before him, and to maintain that his Gospel was not of man, but directly revealed to him by Jesus Christ. In order to prove his independence he categorically states exactly what had been the extent of his intercourse with the elder Apostles. He protests that, after his conversion, he had neither conferred with flesh and blood nor sought those who had been Apostles before him, but, on the contrary, that he had immediately gone away to Arabia. It was not until three years had elapsed that he had gone up to Jerusalem, and then merely to make the acquaintance of Peter, with whom he had remained only fifteen days, during which he had not seen other of the Apostles save James, the Lord's brother. Only after the lapse of fourteen years did he again go up to Jerusalem. It is argued that when Paul says, "he went up again" (*πάλιν ἀνέβην*), the word *πάλιν* has not the force of *δεύτερον*, and that, so far from excluding any intermediate journey, it merely signifies a repetition of what had been done before, and might have been used of any subsequent journey. Even if this were so, it is impossible to deny that, read with its context, *πάλιν ἀνέβην* is used in immediate connection with the former visit which we have just discussed. The sequence is distinctly marked by the *ἔπειτα* "then"; and the adoption of the preposition *διά* which may properly be read "after the lapse of"[1] instead of *μετά*, seems clearly to indicate that no other journey to Jerusalem had been made in the interval. This can be maintained linguistically;

after the third of Acts; and the *Chronicon Paschale* interpolates it between Acts xiii. and xv. It is not now necessary to enter minutely into this.

[1] Winer, *Grammatik des N. T. Sprachidioms*, *7th Aufl.*, § 47, i., p. 356.

but the point is still more decidedly settled when the Apostle's intention is considered. It is obvious that his purpose would have been totally defeated had he passed over in silence an intermediate visit. Even if, as is argued, the visit referred to in Acts xi. 30 had been of very brief duration, or if he had not upon that occasion had any intercourse with the Apostles, it is impossible that he could have ignored it under the circumstances, for by so doing he would have left the retort in the power of his enemies that he had, on other occasions than those which he had enumerated, been in Jerusalem and in contact with the Apostles. The mere fact that a visit had been unmentioned would have exposed him to the charge of having suppressed it, and suspicion is always ready to assign unworthy motives. If Paul had paid such a hasty visit as is suggested, he would naturally have mentioned the fact and stated the circumstances, whatever they were. These and other reasons convince the majority of critics that the Apostle here enumerates all the visits which he had paid to Jerusalem since his conversion. The visit referred to in Gal. ii. 1 f. must be considered the second occasion on which the Apostle Paul went to Jerusalem.

This being the case, can the visit be identified as the second visit described in Acts xi. 30? The object of that journey to Jerusalem, it is expressly stated, was to carry to the brethren in Jerusalem the contributions of the Church of Antioch during a time of famine; whereas Paul explicitly says that he went up to Jerusalem, on the occasion we are discussing, in consequence of a revelation, to communicate the Gospel which he was preaching among the Gentiles. There is not a word about contributions. On the other hand, chronologically it is impossible that the second visit of the Epistle can be the second of the Acts. There is some difference of opinion as to whether the fourteen years are to be calculated from the date of his conversion or from the previous journey. The latter seems to be the more reasonable supposition, but in either case it is obvious that the identity is excluded. From various data—the famine under Claudius, and the time of Herod Agrippa's death—the date of the journey referred to in Acts xi. 30 is assigned to about A.D. 45. If, therefore, we count back fourteen or seventeen years, we have as the date of the conversion, on the first hypothesis, A.D. 31, and on the second A.D. 28, neither of which is tenable. In order to overcome this difficulty, critics at one time proposed, against the unanimous evidence of MSS., to read, instead of διὰ δεκατεσσ. ἐτῶν in Gal. ii. 1, διὰ τεσσάρων ἐτῶν, "after four years"; but this violent remedy is not only generally rejected, but, even if admitted for the sake of argument, it could not establish the identity, inasmuch as the statements in Gal. ii. 1 f. imply a much longer period of missionary

activity amongst the Gentiles than Paul could possibly have had at that time, about which epoch, indeed, Barnabas is said to have sought him in Tarsus, apparently for the purpose of first commencing such a career.[1] Certainly the account of his active ministry begins in the Acts only in chap. xiii. Then, it is not possible to suppose that, if such a dispute regarding circumcision and the Gospel of the uncircumcision as is sketched in Gal. ii. had taken place on a previous occasion, it could so soon be repeated, Acts xv., and without any reference to the former transaction. Comparatively few critics, therefore, have ventured to maintain that the second visit recorded in the Epistle is the same as the second mentioned in the Acts (xi. 30), and in modern times the theory is almost entirely abandoned. If, therefore, it be admitted that Paul mentions all the journeys which he had made to Jerusalem up to the time at which he wrote, and that his second visit was not the second visit of the Acts, but must be placed later, it follows clearly, upon the Apostle's own assurance, that the visit mentioned in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, cannot have taken place and is unhistorical; and this is the conclusion of the majority of critics, including many Apologists, who, whilst suggesting that, for some reason, Barnabas may alone have gone to Jerusalem without Paul, or otherwise deprecating any imputation of conscious inaccuracy to the author, still substantially confirm the result that Paul did not on that occasion go to Jerusalem, and consequently that the statement is not historical. On the other hand, it is suggested that the additional visit to Jerusalem is inserted by the author with a view to conciliation, by representing that Paul was in constant communication with the Apostles and the community of Jerusalem, and that he acted with their approval and sympathy. It is scarcely possible to observe the peculiar variations between the narratives of the Acts and of Paul without feeling that the author of the former deliberately sacrifices the independence and individuality of the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

The great mass of critics agree in declaring that the second visit described in the Epistle is identical with the third recorded in the Acts (xv.), although a wide difference of opinion exists amongst them as to the historical value of the account contained in the latter. This general agreement renders it unnecessary for us to enter at any length into the arguments which establish the identity, and we shall content ourselves with very concisely stating some of the chief reasons for this conclusion. The date in both cases corresponds, whilst there are insuperable chronological objections to identifying the second journey of the Epistle with any earlier or later visit mentioned in Acts. We have referred to other

[1] Acts xi. 25 f.

reasons against its being placed earlier than the third visit of Acts, and there are still stronger objections to its being dated after the third. It is impossible, considering the object of the Apostle, that he could have passed over in silence such a visit as that described Acts xv., and that the only alternative would be to date it later than the composition of the Epistle, to which the narrative of the Acts as well as all other known facts would be irreconcilably opposed. On the other hand, the date, the actors, the cause of dispute, and probably the place (Antioch) in which that dispute originated, so closely correspond that it is incredible that such a coincidence of circumstances should again have occurred.

Without anticipating our comparison of the two accounts of this visit, we must here at least remark that the discrepancies are so great that not only have apologetic critics, as we have indicated, adopted the theory that the second visit of the Epistle is not the same as the third of the Acts, but is identical with the second (xi. 30), of which so few particulars are given, but some, and notably Wieseler,[1] have maintained it to have been the same as that described in Acts xviii. 21 f., whilst Paley and others[2] have

[1] *Chron. ap. Zeit.*, p. 179 f., p. 201 f.; *Br. Pauli an d. Galater*, p. 93 f.

[2] Paley, *Evidences*, and *Horæ Paul.*, ch. v., Nos. 2, 10, p. 367 f., 382 f.; Schrader, *Der Ap. Paulus*, i., p. 75 f., 122 f. It may be well to quote the following passage from Paley, a witness whose testimony will scarcely be suspected of unorthodox partiality: "It must not be dissembled that the comparison of our Epistle with the history presents some difficulties, or, to say the least, some questions of considerable magnitude. It may be doubted, in the first place, to what journey the words which open the second chapter of the Epistle—'then fourteen years afterwards I went unto Jerusalem'—relate. That which best corresponds with the date, and that to which most interpreters apply the passage, is the journey of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, when they went thither from Antioch, upon the business of the Gentile converts, and which journey produced the famous council and decree recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Acts. To me this opinion appears to be encumbered with strong objections. In the Epistle, Paul tells us that 'he went up by revelation' (ii. 2). In the Acts we read that he was sent by the Church of Antioch. 'After no small dissension and disputation, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and elders about this question' (xv. 2). This is not very reconcilable. In the Epistle St. Paul writes that, when he came to Jerusalem, 'he communicated that Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation' (ii. 2). If by 'that Gospel' he meant the immunity of the Gentile Christians from the Jewish law (and I know not what else it can mean), it is not easy to conceive how he should communicate that privately, which was the subject of his public message. But a yet greater difficulty remains—viz., that in the account which the Epistle gives of what passed upon this visit at Jerusalem, no notice is taken of the deliberation and decree which are recorded in the Acts, and which, according to that history, formed the business for the sake of which the journey was undertaken. The mention of the council and of its determination, whilst the Apostle was relating his proceedings at

been led to the hypothesis that the visit in question does not correspond with any of the visits actually recorded in the Acts, but is one which is not referred to at all in that work. These theories have found very little favour, however, and we mention them solely to complete our statement of the general controversy. Considering the fulness of the report of the visit in Acts xv. and the peculiar nature of the facts stated by the Apostle himself in his letter to the Galatians, the difficulty of identifying the particular visit referred to is a phenomenon which cannot be too much considered. Is it possible, if the narrative in the Acts were really historically accurate, that any reasonable doubt could ever have existed as to its correspondence with the Apostle's statements? We may here at once say that, although many of the critics who finally decide that the visit described in Acts xv. is the same as that referred to in the second chapter of the Epistle argue that the obvious discrepancies and contradictions between the two accounts may be sufficiently explained and reconciled, this is for very strong reasons disputed, and the narrative in the Acts, when tested by the authentic statements of the Apostle, pronounced inaccurate and unhistorical.

It is only necessary to read the two accounts in order to understand the grounds upon which even Apologists like Paley and Wieseler feel themselves compelled to suppose that the Apostle is describing transactions which occurred during some visit either unmentioned or not fully related in the Acts, rather than identify it with the visit reported in the fifteenth chapter, from which it so essentially differs. A material difference is not denied by anyone, and explanations with a view to reconciliation have never been dispensed with. Thiersch, who has nothing better than the usual apologetic explanations to offer, does not hesitate to avow the apparent incongruities of the two narratives. "The journey," he says, "is the same, but no human ingenuity can make out that also the conference and the decree resulting from it are the same."[1] He supposes that the problem is to be solved by asserting that the Apostle speaks of the private, the historian of the public, circumstances of the visit. All who maintain the historical character of the Acts must, of course, more or less thoroughly adopt this argument; but it is obvious that, in doing so, they admit, on the one hand, the general discrepancy, and, on the other, if successful in establishing their position, they could do no more than show that the Epistle does not absolutely exclude the account in the Acts. Both writers profess to describe events which occurred during the

Jerusalem, could hardly have been avoided if in truth the narrative belonged to the same journey. To me it appears more probable that Paul and Barnabas had taken some journey to Jerusalem, the mention of which is omitted in the Acts....." (*Evidences*, and *Horæ Paulinæ*, ch. v., No. 10, p. 382).

[1] Thiersch, *Die Kirche im ap. Zeitalter*, p. 129.

same visit; both record matters of the highest interest closely bearing on the same subject; yet the two accounts are so different from each other that they can only be rescued from complete antagonism by complete separation. Supposing the author of the Acts to be really acquainted with the occurrences of this visit, and to have intended to give a plain unvarnished account of them, the unconscious ingenuity with which he has omitted the important facts mentioned by Paul, and eliminated the whole of the Apostle's individuality, would indeed be as remarkable as it is unfortunate. But, supposing the Apostle Paul to have been aware of the formal proceedings narrated in the Acts, characterised by such unanimity and liberal Christian feeling, it would be still more astonishing and unfortunate that he has not only silently passed them over, but has conveyed so singularly different an impression of his visit.[1] As the Apostle certainly could not have been acquainted with the Acts, his silence regarding the Council and its momentous decree, as well as his ignorance of the unbroken harmony which prevailed, are perfectly intelligible. He, of course, only knew and described what actually occurred. The author of the Acts, however, might and must have known the Epistle to the Galatians, and the ingenuity with which the tone and details of the authentic report are avoided or transfigured cannot be ascribed to mere accident, but must largely be attributed to design, although also partly, it may be, to the ignorance and the pious imagination of a later age. Is it possible, for instance, that the controversy regarding the circumcision of Titus, and the dispute with Peter at Antioch, which are so prominently related in the Epistle, but present a view so different from the narrative of Acts, can have been undesignedly omitted? The violent apologetic reconciliation which is effected between the two accounts is based upon the foregone conclusion that the author of the canonical Acts, however he may seem to deviate from the Apostle, cannot possibly contradict him or be in error; but the preceding examination has rendered such a position untenable, and here we have not to do with a canonised "St. Luke," but with an unknown writer, whose work must be judged by the ordinary rules of criticism.

According to the Acts, a most serious question is raised at Antioch. Certain men from Judæa came thither teaching, "Except ye have been circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved." After much dissension and disputation, the Church of Antioch appoint that Paul and Barnabas, "and certain

[1] "Our difficulty in reading this page of history arises not so much from the absence of light as from the perplexity of cross lights. The narratives of St. Luke and St. Paul only then cease to conflict when we take into account the different positions of the writers and the different objects they had in view" (Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 224).

others of them," shall go up to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and elders about this question. The motive of the journey is here most distinctly and definitely described. Paul is solemnly deputed by the Church to lay before the mother Church of Jerusalem a difficult question, upon the answer to which turns the whole future of Christianity. Paul's account gives a very different complexion to the visit: "Then, after fourteen years, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus also with me. But I went up according to revelation (*κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν*) and communicated to them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles," etc. Paley might well say: "This is not very reconcilable."[1] It is argued[2] that the two statements may supplement each other; that the revelation may have been made to the Church of Antioch and have led to the mission; or that, being made to Paul, it may have decided him to undertake it. If, however, we admit that the essence of truth consists not in the mere letter but in the spirit of what is stated, it seems impossible to reconcile these accounts. It might be granted that a historian, giving a report of events which had occurred, might omit some secret motive actuating the conduct even of one of the principal persons with whom he has to do; but that the Apostle, under the actual circumstances, and while protesting, "Now the things which I am writing unto you, behold, before God, I lie not!" should altogether suppress the important official character of his journey to Jerusalem, and give it the distinct colour of a visit voluntarily and independently made *κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν*, is inconceivable. As we proceed, it will become apparent that the divergence between the two accounts is systematic and fundamental; but we may here so far anticipate as to point out that the Apostle explicitly excludes an official visit not only by stating an "inward motive," and omitting all mention of a public object, but by the expression, "and communicated to them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to those who," etc. To quote Paley's words: "If by 'that Gospel' he meant the immunity of the

[1] *Horæ Paul.*, ch. v., No. x. See back, p. 698, note 2.

[2] "Here, however, there is no contradiction. The historian naturally records the external impulse which led to the mission; the Apostle himself states his inward motive. 'What I did,' he says, 'I did not owing to circumstances, not as yielding to pressure, not in deference to others, but because the Spirit of God told me it was right.' The very stress which he lays on this revelation seems to show that other influences were at work" (!) (Lightfoot, *St. P. Ep. to the Gal.*, p. 124). Dr. Lightfoot quotes as parallel cases, suggesting how the one motive might supplement the other, Acts ix. 29, 30; cf. xxii, 17, xxiii. 2–4, and xv. 28. It is unfortunate that all these "parallel cases" are taken from the work whose accuracy is in question, and that the first is actually discredited by the Apostle's own account, whilst the others are open to equally strong objections. See also Alford, *Greek Test.*, ii., *Prolegs.*, p. 27, iii., p. 12; Meyer, *Br. an die Gal.*, p. 61 f.

Gentile Christians from the Jewish law (and I know not what else it can mean), it is not easy to conceive how he should communicate that privately, which was the subject of his public message";[1] and we may add, how he should so absolutely alter the whole character of his visit. In the Acts, he is an ambassador charged with a most important mission; in the Epistle, he is Paul the Apostle, moved solely by his own reasons again to visit Jerusalem. The author of the Acts, however, who is supposed to record only the external circumstances, when tested is found to do so very imperfectly, for he omits all mention of Titus, who is conjectured to be tacitly included in the "certain others of them," who were appointed by the Church to accompany Paul, and he is altogether silent regarding the strenuous effort to enforce the rite of circumcision in his case, upon which the Apostle lays so much stress. The Apostle, who throughout maintains his simply independent attitude, mentions his taking Titus with him as a purely voluntary act, and certainly conveys no impression that he also was delegated by the Church. We shall presently see how significant the suppression of Titus is in connection with the author's transformation of the circumstances of the visit. In affirming that he went up "according to revelation," Paul proceeds in the very spirit in which he began to write this Epistle. He continues simply to assert his independence and equality with the elder Apostles. In speaking of his first journey he has this object in view, and he states precisely the duration of his visit and whom he saw. If he had suppressed the official character of this second visit and the fact that he submitted for the decision of the Apostles and elders the question of the immunity of the Gentile converts from circumcision, and thus curtly ascribed his going to a revelation, he would have compromised himself in a very serious manner, and exposed himself to a charge of disingenuousness of which his enemies would not have failed to take advantage. But, whether we consider the evidence of the Apostle himself in speaking of this visit, the absence of all external allusion to the supposed proceedings when reference to them would not only have been most appropriate but was almost necessary, the practical contradiction of the whole narrative implied in the subsequent conduct of Peter at Antioch, or the inconsistency of the conduct attributed in it to Paul himself, we are forced back to the natural conclusion that the Apostle does not suppress anything, and does not give so absurdly partial an account of his visit as would be the case if the narrative in the Acts be historical, but that, in a few rapid powerful lines, he completes a suggestive sketch of its chief characteristics. This becomes more apparent at every step we take in our comparison of the two narratives.

[1] *Horæ Paul.*, ch. v., No. x. See p. 698, note 2.

If we pass on to the next stage of the proceedings, we find an equally striking divergence between the two writers, and it must not escape attention that the variations are not merely incidental, but are thorough and consecutive. According to the Acts, there was a solemn congress held in Jerusalem, on which occasion, the Apostles and elders and the Church being assembled, the question whether it was necessary that the Gentiles should be circumcised and bound to keep the law of Moses was fully discussed, and a formal resolution finally adopted by the meeting. The proceedings, in fact, constitute what has always been regarded as the first Council of the Christian Church. The account in the Epistle does not seem to betray any knowledge of such a congress. The Apostle himself says merely: "But I went according to revelation and communicated to them (*αὐτοῖς*) the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which seemed (to be something) (*κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν*)."[1] The opinion that the author of Acts "alludes in a general way to conferences and discussions preceding the congress"[2] is based upon the statement, xv. 4, 5: "And when they came to Jerusalem they were received by the Church and by the Apostles and the elders, and declared all that God did with them. But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees, who believed, saying: That it is necessary to circumcise them and to command them to keep the law of Moses. And the Apostles and the elders came together to see regarding this matter. And when there had been much disputation Peter rose up and said," etc. If it were admitted that more than one meeting is here indicated, it is clear that the words cannot be legitimately strained into a reference to more than two conferences. The first of these is a general meeting of the Apostles and elders and of the Church to receive the delegates from Antioch, and the second is an equally general and public conference (verse 6): not only are the Apostles and elders present, but also the general body of Christians, as clearly appears from the statement (verse 12) that, after the speech of Peter, "all the multitude (*πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος*) kept silence."[3] The "much disputation" evidently takes place on the occasion when the Apostles and elders are gathered together to consider the matter. If, therefore, two meetings can be maintained from the narrative in Acts, both are emphatically public and general, and neither, therefore, the private conference of the Epistle. The main fact that the author of the Acts describes a general congress of the Church as taking place is never called in question.

[1] Gal. ii. 2. [2] Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 125.

[3] It has been pertinently asked, How it is possible that such a meeting could have taken place? What room could have been found to contain the assembly? (cf. Reuss, *N. Rev. de Théol.*, 1858, ii., p. 36).

On the other hand, few who appreciate the nature of the discrepancy which we are discussing will feel that the difficulty is solved by suggesting that there is space for the insertion of other incidents in the Apostle's narrative. It is rather late now to interpolate a general Council of the Church into the pauses of the Galatian letter. To suppose that the communications of Paul to the "Pillar" Apostles, and the distressing debate regarding the circumcision of Titus, may be inferred between the lines of the account in the Acts, is a bold effort of imagination; but it is far from being as hopeless as an attempt to reconcile the discrepancy by thrusting the important public congress into some corner of the Apostle's statement. In so far as any argument is advanced in support of the assertion that Paul's expression implies something more than the private conference, it is based upon the reference intended in the words *ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς*. When Paul says he went up to Jerusalem and communicated "to them" his Gospel, but privately *τοῖς δοκοῦσιν*, whom does he mean to indicate by the *αὐτοῖς*? Does he refer to the Christian community of Jerusalem, or to the Apostles themselves? It is pretty generally admitted that either application is permissible; but whilst a majority of apologetic, together with some independent, critics adopt the former, not a few consider, as Chrysostom, Œcumenius, and Calvin did before them, that Paul more probably referred to the Apostles. In favour of the former there is the fact, it is argued, that the *αὐτοῖς* is used immediately after the statement that the Apostle went up "to Jerusalem," and that it may be more natural to conclude that he speaks of the Christians there, more especially as he seems to distinguish between the communication made *αὐτοῖς* and *κατ' ἰδίαν τοῖς δοκοῦσιν*;[1] and, in support of this, "they" in Gal. i. 23, 24, is, though we think without propriety, referred to. It is, on the other hand, urged that it is very unlikely that the Apostle would in such a way communicate his Gospel to the whole community, and that in the expressions used he indicates no special transaction, but that the *ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς* is merely an indefinite statement for which he immediately substitutes the more precise *κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν*.[2] It is quite certain that there is no

[1] Meyer argues, not without force, that if Paul had not by *κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ* intended to distinguish a different communication, he must have said: *ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς, κ. τ. λ., ἀνεθέμην δὲ τοῖς δοκ.* omitting the distinguishing *κατ' ἰδίαν* (*Br. an die Gal.*, p. 62, anm.).

[2] An able and impartial critic, Reuss, attempts to reconcile the two accounts by arguing that such a question could not possibly have been laid before and decided by the whole community. He, therefore, supposes that private conferences took place. This "reconciliation," however, is excluded by the account in Acts, which so distinctly represents a large public congress, and it by no means lessens the fundamental discrepancy of the narratives (cf. Reuss, *N. Rev. de Théol.*, 1858, ii. 334 f., 1859, iii., p. 62 f.).

mention of the Christian community of Jerusalem to which the αὐτοῖς can with any real grammatical necessity be referred; but when the whole purport of the first part of the Apostle's letter is considered the reference to the Apostles in the αὐτοῖς becomes clearer. Paul is protesting the independence of his Gospel, and that he did not receive it from man, but from Jesus Christ. He wishes to show that he was not taught by the Apostles nor dependent upon them. He states that after his conversion he did not go to those who were Apostles before him, but, on the contrary, went away to Arabia, and only three years after he went up to Jerusalem, and then only for the purpose of making the acquaintance of Peter, and on that occasion other of the Apostles saw he none save James the Lord's brother. After fourteen years, he continues to recount, he again went up to Jerusalem, but according to revelation, and communicated to them—*i.e.*, to the Apostles—the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles. The Apostles have been in the writer's mind throughout, but in the impetuous flow of his ideas, which, in the first two chapters of this Epistle, outrun the pen, the sentences become involved. It must be admitted, finally, that the reference intended is a matter of opinion, and cannot be authoritatively settled. If we suppose it to refer to the community of Jerusalem, taking thus the more favourable construction, how would this affect the question? Can it be maintained that in this casual and indefinite "to them" we have any confirmation of the general congress of the Acts, with its debates, its solemn settlement of that momentous proposition regarding the Gentile Christians, and its important decree? It is impossible to credit that, in saying that he "communicated to them" the Gospel which he preached amongst the Gentiles, the Apostle referred to a Council like that described in the Acts, to which, as a delegate from the Church of Antioch, he submitted the question of the conditions upon which the Gentiles were to be admitted into the Church, and tacitly accepted their decision. Even if it be assumed that the Apostle makes this slight passing allusion to some meeting different from his conference with the pillar Apostles, it could not have been a general congress assembled for the purpose stated in the Acts and characterised by such proceedings. The discrepancy between the two narratives is not lessened by any supposed indication either in the Epistle or in the Acts of other incidents than those actually described. The suggestion that the dispute about Titus involved some publicity does not avail, for the greater the publicity and importance of the episode the greater the difficulty of explaining the total silence regarding it of the author of Acts. The more closely the two statements are compared the more apparent does it become that the author describes proceedings which are totally different in general character, in

details and in spirit, from those so vividly sketched by the Apostle Paul.

We shall have more to say presently regarding the irreconcilable contradiction in spirit between the whole account which is given in the Acts of this Council and the writings of Paul; but it may be more convenient, if less effective, if we, for the present, take the chief points in the narrative as they arise and consider how far they are supported or discredited by other data. We shall refer later to the manner in which the question which leads to the Council is represented as arising, and at once proceed to the speech of Peter. After there had been much disputation as to whether the Gentile Christians must necessarily be circumcised and required to observe the Mosaic law, it is stated that Peter rose up and said: xv. 7., "Men (and) brethren, ye know that a good while ago God made choice among you that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the Gospel and believe. 8. And God which knoweth the hearts bare them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit even as unto us; 9. and put no distinction between us and them, having purified their hearts by the faith. 10. Now, therefore, why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? 11. But by the grace of our Lord Jesus we believe we are saved even as also they."[1] The liberality of the sentiments thus put into the mouth of Peter requires no demonstration, and there is here an explicit expression of convictions, which we must, from his own words, consider to be the permanent and mature views of the Apostle, dating, as they do, "from ancient days" (ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων) and originating in so striking and supernatural a manner. We may, therefore, expect that, whenever we meet with an authentic record of Peter's opinions and conduct elsewhere, they should exhibit the impress of such advanced and divinely-imparted views. The statement which Peter makes, that God had a good while before selected him that the Gentiles by his voice should hear the Gospel, is, of course, a reference to the case of Cornelius, and this unites the fortunes of the speech and proceedings of the Council with that episode. We have seen how little ground there is for considering that narrative, with its elaborate tissue of miracles, historical. The speech which adopts it is thus discredited, and all other circumstances confirm the conclusion that the speech is not authentic. If the name of Peter were erased and that of Paul substituted, the sentiments expressed would be singularly appropriate. We should have the divinely-appointed Apostle of the Gentiles advocating complete immunity from the Mosaic law, and enunciating Pauline principles in

[1] Acts. xv. 7–11.

peculiarly Pauline terms. When Peter declares that "God put no distinction between us (Jews) and them (Gentiles), purifying their hearts by faith,[1] but by the grace (χάριτι) of our Lord Jesus Christ we believe we are saved even as also they," do we not hear Paul's sentiments, so elaborately expressed in the Epistle to the Romans and elsewhere? "For there is no difference between Jew and Greek; for the same Lord of all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved"[2]......"justified freely by his grace (χάριτι) through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."[3] And when Peter exclaims, "Why tempt ye God to put a yoke (ζυγόν) upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" have we not rather a paraphrase of the words in the Epistle to the Galatians? "With liberty Christ made us free; stand fast, therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke (ζυγῷ) of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you that, if ye be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing. But I testify again to every man who is circumcised that he is a debtor to do the whole law[4].....For as many as are of works of law are under a curse," etc.[5] These are only a few sentences of which the speech in Acts is an echo, but no attentive reader can fail to perceive that it contains in germ the whole of Pauline universalism.

From the Pauline author of the Acts this might fairly be expected, and, if we linguistically examine the speech, we have additional evidence that it is simply, like others which we have considered, a composition from his own pen.[6] It cannot be doubted that the language is that of the author of the Acts, and no serious attempt has ever been made to show that it is the language of Peter. If it be asserted that, in the form before us, it is a translation, there is not the slightest evidence to support the assertion; and it has to contend with the unfortunate circumstance that, in the supposed process, the words of Peter have not only become the words of the author, but his thoughts the thoughts of Paul.

We may now inquire whether we find in authentic records of the Apostle Peter's conduct and views any confirmation of the liberality which is attributed to him in the Acts. He is here represented as proposing the emancipation of Gentile converts from the Mosaic law: does this accord with the statements of the

[1] Cf. Rom. iv. 13.

[2] Rom. x. 12, 13; cf. Gal. iii. 26 f.: "For ye are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus;.....There is neither Jew nor Greek;.....for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus."

[3] Rom. iii. 24. [4] Gal. v. 1–3. [5] *Ib.*, iii. 10.

[6] The linguistic analysis will be found in the complete edition, vol. iii., pp. 239–241.

Apostle Paul and with such information as we can elsewhere gather regarding Peter? Very much the contrary.

Peter in this speech claims that, long before, God had selected him to make known the Gospel to the Gentiles, but Paul emphatically distinguishes him as the Apostle of the Circumcision; and although, accepting facts which had actually taken place and could not be prevented, Peter with James and John gave Paul right hands of fellowship, he remained, as he had been before, Apostle of the Circumcision,[1] and, as we shall see, did not practise the liberality which he is said to have preached. Very shortly after the Council described in the Acts, there occurred the celebrated dispute between him and Paul which the latter proceeds to describe immediately after the visit to Jerusalem: "But when Cephas came to Antioch," he writes, "I withstood him to the face, for he was condemned. For before certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they came, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing those of the Circumcision. And the other Jews also joined in his hypocrisy, insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, I said unto Cephas before all: If thou being a Jew livest (ζῇς) after the manner of Gentiles and not after the manner of Jews, how compellest (ἀναγκάζεις) thou the Gentiles to adopt the customs of the Jews? (ἰουδαΐζειν)"[2]

It is necessary to say a few words as to the significance of Peter's conduct and of Paul's rebuke, regarding which there is some difference of opinion.[3] Are we to understand from this that Peter, as a general rule, at Antioch and elsewhere, with enlightened emancipation from Jewish prejudices, lived as a Gentile and in full communion with Gentile Christians?[4] Meyer[5] and others argue that, by the use of the present ζῇς, the Apostle indicates a continuous practice based upon principle, and that the ζῆν is not the mere moral life, but includes the external social observances of Christian community; the object, in fact, being to show that upon principle Peter held the advanced liberal views of Paul, and that the fault which he committed in withdrawing from free intercourse with the Gentile Christians was momentary, and merely the result of "occasional timidity and weakness." This theory cannot bear

[1] Gal. ii. 7 f. [2] *Ib.*, ii. 11–14.

[3] Cf. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Ep. to the Gal.*, 338.

[4] Hilgenfeld argues that in speaking of "eating with them" Paul refers to the Agape, the meals of the Christians which had a religious significance. Although this is well worthy of consideration, it is not necessary for us here to go into the question (cf. *Galaterbrief*, p. 59 f.; *Zeitschr. wiss. Th.*, 1858, p. 87 f.).

[5] *Br. an die Gal.*, 98 f.

the test of examination. The account of Paul is clearly this: *when Cephas came to Antioch*, the stronghold of Gentile Christianity, *before certain men came from James*, he ate with the Gentiles, but as soon as these emissaries arrived he withdrew, "fearing those of the circumcision." Had his normal custom been to live like the Gentiles, how is it possible that he could, on this occasion only, have feared those of the circumcision? His practice must have been notorious; and had he, moreover, actually expressed such opinions in the congress of Jerusalem, his confession of faith having been so publicly made, and so unanimously approved by the Church, there could not have been any conceivable cause for such timidity. The fact evidently is, on the contrary, that Peter, under the influence of Paul, was induced for the time to hold free communion with the Gentile Christians; but as soon as the emissaries of James appeared on the scene he became alarmed at this departure from his principles, and fell back again into his normal practice. If the present ζῇς be taken to indicate continuous habit of life, the present ἀναγκάζεις very much more than neutralises it. Paul with his usual uncompromising frankness rebukes the vacillation of Peter; by adopting even for a time fellowship with the Gentiles, Peter has practically recognised its validity, has been guilty of hypocrisy in withdrawing from his concession on the arrival of the followers of James, and is condemned; but after such a concession he cannot legitimately demand that Gentile converts should "judaise." It is obvious that whilst Peter lived as a Gentile he could not have been compelling the Gentiles to adopt Judaism. Paul, therefore, in saying, "Why compellest thou (ἀναγκάζεις) the Gentiles to adopt the customs of the Jews? (ἰουδαΐζειν)," very distinctly intimates that the normal practice of Peter was to compel Gentile Christians to adopt Judaism. There is no escaping this conclusion, for, after all specious reasoning to the contrary is exhausted, there remains the simple fact that Peter, when placed in a dilemma on the arrival of the emissaries of James, and forced to decide whether he will continue to live as a Gentile or as a Jew, adopts the latter alternative, and, as Paul tells us, "compels" (in the present) the Gentiles to judaise. A stronger indication of his views could scarcely have been given. Not a word is said which implies that Peter yielded to the vehement protests of Paul, but, on the contrary, we must undoubtedly conclude that he did not; for it is impossible to suppose that Paul would not have stated a fact so pertinent to his argument, had the elder Apostle been induced by his remonstrance to walk uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel which Paul preached, and both to teach and practise Christian universalism. We shall have abundant reason, apart from this, to conclude that Peter did not yield, and it is no false indication of this that, a

century after, we find the *Clementine Homilies* expressing the bitterness of the Petrine party against the Apostle of the Gentiles for this very rebuke, and representing Peter as following his course from city to city for the purpose of refuting Paul's unorthodox teaching.

It is contended that Peter's conduct at Antioch is in harmony with his denial of his master related in the Gospels, and, therefore, that such momentary and characteristic weakness might well have been displayed even after his adoption of liberal principles. Those who argue in this way forget that the denial of Jesus, as described in the Gospels, proceeded from the fear of death, and that such a reply to a merely compromising question, which did not directly involve principles, is a very different thing from conduct like that at Antioch, where, under one influence, a line of action was temporarily adopted which ratified views upon which the opinion of the Church was divided, and then abandoned merely from fear of the disapproval of those of the circumcision. The author of the Acts passes over this altercation in complete silence. No one has ever called in question the authenticity of the account which Paul gives of it. If Peter had the courage to make such a speech at the Council in the very capital of Judaic Christianity, and in the presence of James and the whole Church, how could he possibly, from fear of a few men from Jerusalem, have shown such pusillanimity in Antioch, where Paul and the mass of Christians supported him? If the unanimous decision of the Council had really been a fact, how easily he might have silenced any objections by an appeal to that which had "seemed good to the Holy Spirit" and to the Church! But there is not the slightest knowledge of the Council and its decree betrayed either by those who came from James, or by Peter, or Paul. The episode at Antioch is inconsistent with the conduct and words ascribed to Peter in the Acts, and contradicts the narrative in the fifteenth chapter which we are examining.

The author of the Acts states that, after Peter had spoken, "all the multitude kept silence and were hearing Barnabas and Paul declaring what signs and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them."[1] We shall not at present pause to consider this statement, nor the *rôle* which Paul is made to play in the whole transaction, beyond pointing out that, on an occasion when such a subject as the circumcision of the Gentiles and their subjection to the Mosaic law was being discussed, nothing could be more opposed to nature than to suppose that a man like the author of the Epistle to the Galatians could have assumed so passive and subordinate an attitude. After Barnabas and Paul

[1] xv. 12.

had spoken, James is represented as saying: "Men (and) brethren, hear me. Simeon declared how God at first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And with this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written: 'After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which has fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and will set it up: that the residue of men may seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name has been called, saith the Lord who doeth these things, known from the beginning.' Wherefore, I judge that we trouble not those from among the Gentiles who are turning to God; but that we write unto them that they abstain from the pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood. For Moses from generations of old hath in every city those who preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath."[1] There are many reasons for which this speech also must be pronounced inauthentic. It may be observed, in passing, that James completely disregards the statement which Barnabas and Paul are supposed to make as to what God had wrought by them among the Gentiles; and, ignoring their intervention, he directly refers to the preceding speech of Peter claiming to have first been selected to convert the Gentiles. We shall reserve discussion of the conditions which James proposes to impose upon Gentile Christians till we come to the apostolic decree which embodies them.

The precise signification of the sentence with which (verse 21) he concludes has been much debated, but need not detain us long. Whatever may be said of the liberal part of the speech, it is obvious that the author has been more true to the spirit of the time in conceiving this and other portions of it than in composing the speech of Peter. The continued observance of the Mosaic ritual, and the identity of the synagogue with the Christian Church, are correctly indicated; and when James is again represented (xxi. 20 f.) as advising Paul to join those who had a vow, in order to prove that he himself walked orderly and was an observer of the law, and did not teach the Jews to apostatise from Moses and abandon the rite of circumcision, he is consistent in his portrait. It is nevertheless clear that, however we may read the restrictions which James proposes to impose upon Gentile Christians, the author of Acts intends them to be considered as a most liberal and almost complete concession of immunity. "I judge," he makes James say, "that we trouble not those from among the Gentiles who are turning to God"; and again, on the second occasion of which we have just been speaking, in referring to the decree, a contrast is drawn between the Christian Jews, from

[1] Acts xv. 13–20.

whom observance of the law is demanded, and the Gentiles, who are only expected to follow the prescriptions of the decree.

James is represented as supporting the statement of Peter how God visited the Gentiles by "the words of the Prophets," quoting a passage from Amos ix. 11, 12. It is difficult to see how the words, even as quoted, apply to the case at all; but this is immaterial. Loose reasoning can certainly not be taken as a mark of inauthenticity. It is much more to the point that James, addressing an assembly of Apostles and elders in Jerusalem, quotes the prophet Amos freely from the Septuagint version,[1] which differs widely in the latter and more important part from the Hebrew text. The passage in the Hebrew reads: ix. 11. "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old, 12. that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord that doeth this." The authors of the Septuagint version altered the twelfth verse into: "That the residue of men may seek after the Lord and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord who doeth these things." It is perfectly clear that the prophet does not, in the original, say what James is here represented as stating, and that his own words refer to the national triumph of Israel, and not to the conversion of the Gentiles. Amos, in fact, prophesies that the Lord will restore the former power and glory of Israel, and that the remnant of Edom and the other nations of the theocracy shall be re-united, as they were under David. No one questions the fact that the original prophecy is altered. The question as to whether James or the author of the Acts is responsible for the adoption of the Septuagint version is felt to be a serious problem. Some critics affirm that in all probability James must have spoken in Aramaic; whilst others maintain that he delivered this address in Greek. In the one case, it is supposed that he quoted the original Hebrew, and that the author of the Acts, or the document from which he derived his report, may have used the Septuagint; and in the other, it is suggested that the LXX. may have had another and more correct reading before them, for it is supposed impossible that James himself could have quoted a version which was actually different from the original Hebrew. These and many other similar explanations, into which we need not go, do little to remove the difficulty presented by the fact itself. To suppose that our Hebrew texts are erroneous in order to justify the speech is a proceeding which

[1] "St. James and St. Luke *adopt* that version as not contrary to the mind of the Spirit, and indeed as expressing that mind," etc. (Wordsworth, *Gk. Test., The Acts*, p. 113).

does not require remark. It will be remembered that in the Acts the Septuagint is always employed in quotations from the Old Testament, and that this is by no means the only place in which that version is used when it departs from the original. It is difficult to conceive that any intelligent Jew could have quoted the Hebrew of this passage to support a proposal to free Gentile Christians from the necessity of circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic Law. It is equally difficult to suppose that James, a bigoted leader of the Judaistic party and the head of the Church at Jerusalem, could have quoted the Septuagint version of the Holy Scriptures, differing from the Hebrew, to such an assembly. It is useless to examine here the attempts to make the passage quoted a correct interpretation of the prophet's meaning, or seriously to consider the proposition that this alteration of a prophetic utterance is adopted as better expressing "the mind of the Spirit." If the original prophecy did not express that mind, it is rather late to amend the utterances of the prophets in the Acts of the Apostles.

Linguistic analysis[1] confirms the conclusion that the speech of James at the Council proceeds likewise from the pen of the general author, and the incomprehensible liberality of the sentiments expressed, as well as the peculiarity of the quotation from Amos according to the Septuagint, thus receive at once their simple explanation.

If we now compare the account of James's share in granting liberal conditions to Gentile Christians with the statements of Paul, we arrive at the same result. It is in consequence of the arrival of "certain men from James" (τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου) that Peter, through fear of them, withdrew from communion with the Gentiles. It will be remembered that the whole discussion is said to have arisen in Antioch originally from the Judaistic teaching of certain men who came "from Judæa," who are disowned in the apostolic letter.[2] It is unfortunate, to say the least of it, that so many of those who systematically opposed the work of the Apostle Paul claimed to represent the views of James and the mother Church.[3] The contradiction of the author of the Acts, with his object of conciliation, has but small weight

[1] The linguistic analysis will be found in the complete edition, vol. iii., pp. 252–254.

[2] Acts xv. 24.

[3] "Of the Judaisers who are denounced in St. Paul's Epistles this much is certain, that they exalted the authority of the Apostles of the Circumcision; and that, in some instances at least, as members of the mother Church, they had direct relations with James, the Lord's brother. But when we attempt to define those relations we are lost in a maze of conjecture" (Lightfoot, *Ep. to the Gal.*, p. 353).

before the statements of Paul and the whole voice of tradition. At any rate, almost immediately after the so-called Apostolic Council, with its decree adopted mainly at the instigation of James, his emissaries caused the defection of Peter in Antioch and the rupture with Paul. It is generally admitted, in the face of the clear affirmation of Paul, that the men in question must in all probability have been actually sent by James. It is obvious that, to justify the fear of so leading an apostle as Peter, not only must they have been thus deputed, but must have been influential men, representing authoritative and prevalent Judaistic opinions. We shall not attempt to divine the object of their mission, but we may say that it is impossible to separate them from the Judaistic teachers who urged circumcision upon the Galatian Christians and opposed the authority of the Apostle Paul. Not pursuing this further at present, however, it is obvious that the effect produced by these emissaries is quite incompatible with the narrative that, so short a time before, James and the Church of Jerusalem had unanimously promulgated conditions, under which the Gentile Christians were freely admitted into communion, and which fully justified Peter in eating with them. The incident at Antioch, as connected with James as well as with Peter, excludes the supposition that the account of the Council contained in the Acts can be considered historical.

The Apostolic letter embodying the decree of the Council now demands our attention. It seemed good to the Apostles and the elders with the whole Church to choose two leading men among the brethren, and to send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas, and they wrote by them (xv. 23): "The Apostles and brethren which are elders unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia, greeting. 24. Forasmuch as we heard that certain which went out from us troubled you with words, subverting your souls, to whom we gave no commandment, 25. it seemed good unto us, having become of one mind, to choose out and send men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, 26. men that have given up their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. 27. We have, therefore, sent Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by word of mouth. 28. For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: 29. that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well. Fare ye well." It is argued that the simplicity of this composition, its brevity and the absence of hierarchical tendency, prove the authenticity and the originality of the epistle. Nothing, however, could be more arbitrary than to assert that the author of the Acts, composing a letter supposed to

be written under the circumstances, would have written one different from this. We shall, on the contrary, see good reason for affirming that he actually did compose it, and that it bears the obvious impress of his style. Besides, Zeller[1] has pointed out that, in a document affirmed to be so removed from all calculation or object, verse 26 could hardly have found a place. The reference to "our beloved" Barnabas and Paul, as "men that have given up their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," is scarcely consistent with the primitive brevity and simplicity which are made the basis of such an argument.

In the absence of better evidence, Apologists grasp at extremely slight indications of authenticity, and of this nature seems to us the mark of genuineness which Bleek and others[2] consider that they find in the fact that the name of Barnabas is placed before that of Paul in this document. It is maintained that, from the 13th chapter, the author begins to give the precedence to Paul, but that, in reverting to the former order, the synodal letter gives evidence both of its antiquity and genuineness. If any weight could be attached to such an indication, it is unfortunate for this argument that the facts are not as stated, for the order "Barnabas and Paul" occurs at xiv. 12 and 14, and even in the very account of the Council at xv. 12. The two names are mentioned together in the Acts sixteen times, Barnabas being named first eight times (xi. 30, xii. 25, xiii. 1, 2, 7, xiv. 12, 14, xv. 12), and Paul as frequently (xiii. 43, 46, 50, xv. 2 twice, 22, 25, 35). Apologists like Lekebusch[3] and Oertel[4] reject Bleek's argument. The greeting χαίρειν, with which the letter opens, and which, amongst the Epistles of the New Testament, is only found in that bearing the name of James (i. 1), is said to be an indication that the letter of the Council was written by James himself. Before such an argument could avail, it would be necessary, though difficult, to prove the authenticity of the Epistle of James, but we need not enter upon such a question. χαίρειν is the ordinary Greek form of greeting in all epistles,[5] and the author of Acts, who writes purer Greek than any other writer in our Canon, naturally adopts it. Not only does he do so here, but he makes use of the same χαίρειν in the letter of the chief captain Lysias (xxiii. 26),[6] which also evidently proceeds from his hand. More-

[1] *Apostelgesch.*, 246 f.

[2] Bleek, *Einl.*, p. 349; Baumgarten, *Apg.*, p. 470 f.; Ewald, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi., p. 440, anm.; Gloag, *Acts*, ii., p. 89 f.; Lange, *Das ap. Z.*, ii., p. 189; Meyer, *Apg.*, p. 345 f.

[3] *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 316. [4] *Paulus in D. Apostelgesch.*, 1868, p. 227.

[5] Wetstein quotes Artemidorus (*Oneir.*, iii. 44): ἴδιον πάσης ἐπιστολῆς τὸ χαίρειν καὶ ἐρῶσο λέγειν (*Ad Act. Apost.*, xv. 2).

[6] This letter terminates, v. 30, with the usual ἔρρωσο, according to the *Cod. Sinaiticus*, *E*, *G*, and others; *A* and *B* omit it.

over, the word is used as a greeting in Luke i. 28, and not unfrequently elsewhere in the New Testament, as Matt. xxvi. 49, xxvii. 29, xxviii. 9, Mark xv. 18, John xix. 3, 2 John 10, 11. Lekebusch,[1] Meyer,[2] and Oertel[3] reject the argument, and we may add that, if χαίρειν prove anything, it proves that the author of Acts, who uses the word in the letter of Lysias, also wrote the synodal letter.

In what language must we suppose that the Epistle was originally written? Oertel maintains an Aramaic original,[4] but the greater number of writers consider that the original language was Greek. It cannot be denied that the composition, as it stands, contains many of the peculiarities of style of the author of Acts; and these are, indeed, so marked that even Apologists like Lekebusch and Oertel, whilst maintaining the substantial authenticity of the Epistle, admit that at least its actual form must be ascribed to the general author. The originality of the form being abandoned, it is difficult to perceive any ground for asserting the originality and genuineness of the substance. That assertion rests solely upon a vague traditional confidence in the author of Acts, which is shown to be without any solid foundation. The form of this Epistle clearly professes to be as genuine as the substance, and if the original language was Greek, there is absolutely no reason why the original letter should have been altered. The similarity of the construction to that of the prologue to the third Gospel, in which the personal style of the writer may be supposed to have been most unreservedly shown, has long been admitted: —

Luke. i.	Acts xv.
1. ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι.....	24. ἐπειδὴ ἠκούσαμεν ὅτι τινὲς ἐτάραξαν .....
3. ἔδοξε κἀμοί, παρηκολουθηκότι πασιν ἀκριβῶς, καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι.	25. ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδόν. ἄνδρας πέμψαι.

A more detailed linguistic examination of the Epistle, however, confirms the conclusion already stated.[5]

Turning now from the letter to the spirit of this decree, we must endeavour to form some idea of its purport and bearing. The first point which should be made clear is, that the question raised before the Council solely affected the Gentile converts, and that the conditions contained in the decree were imposed upon that branch of the Church alone. No change whatever in the

[1] *Apostelg.*, p. 316. [2] *Apostelg.*, p. 345.

[3] *Paul. in d. Apg.*, p. 227; comp. Reiche, *Comm. in Ep. Jac.*, 1833, p. 1.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 227 f.; cf. Grotius, *Annot. in N. T. ad Act. Ap.*, xv. 23, who takes χαίρειν to be the rendering of the Hebrew salutation of Peace.

[5] The linguistic analysis will be found in the complete edition, vol. iii., p. 260 f.

position of Jewish Christians was contemplated; they were left as before, subject to the Mosaic law. This is very apparent in the reference which is made long after to the decree, ch. xxi. 20 f., 25, when the desire is expressed to Paul by James, who proposed the decree, and the elders of Jerusalem, that he should prove to the many thousands of believing Jews, all zealous of the law, that he did not teach the Jews who were among the Gentiles apostasy from Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. Paul, who is likewise represented in the Acts as circumcising with his own hand, after the decision of the Council had been adopted, Timothy the son of a Greek, whose mother was a Jewess, consents to give the Jews of Jerusalem the required proof. We have already shown, at the commencement of this section, that nothing was further from the minds of the Jewish Christians than the supposition that the obligation to observe the Mosaic law was weakened by the adoption of Christianity; and the representation in the Acts is certainly so far correct that it does not pretend that Jewish Christians either desired or sanctioned any relaxation of Mosaic observances on the part of believing Jews. This cannot be too distinctly remembered in considering the history of primitive Christianity. The initiatory rite was essential to full participation in the Covenant. It was left for Paul to preach the abrogation of the law and the abandonment of circumcision. If the speech of Peter seems to suggest the abrogation of the law even for Jews, it is only in a way which shows that the author had no clear historical fact to relate, and merely desired to ascribe, vaguely and indefinitely, Pauline sentiments to the Apostle of the circumcision. No remark is made upon these strangely liberal expressions of Peter, and neither the proposition of James nor the speech in which he states it takes the slightest notice of them. The conduct of Peter at Antioch and the influence exercised by James through his emissaries restore us to historical ground. Whether the author intended to represent that the object of the conditions of the decree was to admit the Gentile Christians to full communion with the Jewish, or merely to the subordinate position of Proselytes of the Gate, is uncertain, but it is not necessary to discuss the point.

There is not the slightest external evidence that such a decree ever existed, and the more closely the details are examined the more evident does it become that it has no historical consistency. How, and upon what principle, were these singular conditions selected? Their heterogeneous character is at once apparent, but not so the reason for a combination which is neither limited to Jewish customs nor sufficiently representative of moral duties. It has been argued, on the one hand, that the prohibitions of the

apostolic decree are simply those, reduced to a necessary minimum, which were enforced in the case of heathen converts to Judaism, who did not join themselves fully to the people of the Covenant by submitting to circumcision, but were admitted to imperfect communion as Proselytes of the Gate. The conditions named, however, do not fully represent the rules framed for such cases, and many critics consider that the conditions imposed, although they may have been influenced by the Noachian prescriptions, were rather moral duties which it was, from special circumstances, thought expedient to specify. We shall presently refer to some of these conditions; but bearing in mind the views which were dominant amongst primitive Christians, and more especially, as is obvious, amongst the Christians of Jerusalem, where this decree is supposed to have been unanimously adopted—bearing in mind the teaching which is said to have led to the Council, the episode at Antioch, and the systematic Judaistic opposition which retarded the work of Paul and subsequently affected his reputation, it may be instructive to point out not only the vagueness which exists as to the position which it was intended that the Gentiles should acquire, as the effect of this decree, but also its singular and total inefficiency. An apologetic writer, having of course in his mind the fact that there is no trace of the operation of the decree, speaks of its conditions as follows: "The miscellaneous character of these prohibitions showed that, taken as a whole, they had no binding force independently of the circumstances which dictated them. They were a temporary expedient framed to meet a temporary emergency. Their object was the avoidance of offence in mixed communities of Jew and Gentile converts. Beyond this recognised aim and general understanding implied therein, the limits of their application were not defined."[1] In fact, the immunity granted to the Gentiles was thus practically almost unconditional.

It is obvious that every consideration which represents the decree as more completely emancipating Gentile Christians from Mosaic obligations, and admitting them into free communion with believers amongst the Jews, places it in more emphatic contradiction to historical facts and the statements of the Apostle Paul. The unanimous adoption of such a measure in Jerusalem, on the one hand, and, on the other, the episode at Antioch, the fear of Peter, the silence of Paul, and the attitude of James, become perfectly inconceivable. If, on the contrary, the conditions were seriously imposed and really meant anything, a number of difficulties spring up of which we shall presently speak. That the prohibitions, in the opinion of the author of the Acts, constituted

[1] Lightfoot, *Ep. to the Gal.*, p. 296.

a positive and binding obligation can scarcely be doubted by anyone who considers the terms in which they are laid down. If they are represented as a concession, they are nevertheless recognised as a "burden," and they are distinctly stated to be the obligations which "it seemed good to the Holy Spirit" as well as to the Council to impose. The qualification, that the restrictive clauses had no binding force "independently of the circumstances which dictated them," in so far as it has any meaning beyond the unnecessary declaration that the decree was only applicable to the class for whom it was framed, seems to be inadmissible. The circumstance which dictated the decree was the counter-teaching of Jewish Christians, that it was necessary that the Gentile converts should be circumcised and keep the law of Moses. The restrictive clauses are simply represented as those which it was deemed right to impose; and, as they are stated without qualification, it is holding the decision of the "Holy Spirit" and of the Church somewhat cheap to treat them as mere local and temporary expedients. This is evidently not the view of the author of the Acts. Would it have been the view of anyone else if it were not that, so far as any external trace of the decree is concerned, it is an absolute myth? The prevalence of practices to which the four prohibitions point is quite sufficiently attested to show that, little as there is any ground for considering that such a decree was framed in such a manner, the restrictive clauses are put forth as necessary and permanently binding. The very doubt which exists as to whether the prohibitions were not intended to represent the conditions imposed on Proselytes of the Gate shows their close analogy to them, and it cannot be reasonably asserted that the early Christians regarded those conditions either as obsolete or indifferent. The decree is clearly intended to set forth the terms upon which Gentile Christians were to be admitted into communion, and undoubtedly is to be taken as applicable not merely to a few districts, but to the Gentiles in general.

The account which Paul gives of his visit not only ignores any such decree, but excludes it. In the first place, taking into account the Apostle's character and the spirit of his Epistle, it is impossible to suppose that Paul had any intention of submitting, as to higher authority, the Gospel which he preached, for the judgment of the elder Apostles and of the Church of Jerusalem. Nothing short of this is involved in the account in the Acts, and in the form of the decree which promulgates, in an authoritative manner, restrictive clauses which "seemed good to the Holy Spirit" and to the Council. The temper of the man is well shown in Paul's indignant letter to the Galatians. He receives his Gospel, not from men, but by direct revelation from Jesus Christ; and so far is he from submission of the kind implied that he

says: "But even though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any Gospel other than that which we preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so say I now again: If any man preach any Gospel to you other than that ye received, let him be accursed."[1] That the Apostle here refers to his own peculiar teaching, and does so in contradistinction to the Gospel preached by the Judaisers, is evident from the preceding words: "I marvel that ye are so soon removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different Gospel; which is not another, only there are some that trouble you, and desire to pervert the Gospel of Christ."[2] Passing from this, however, to the restrictive clauses in general, how is it possible that Paul could state, as the result of his visit, that the "pillar" Apostles "communicated nothing" after hearing his Gospel, if the four conditions of this decree had thus been authoritatively "communicated"? On the contrary, Paul distinctly adds that, in acknowledging his mission, but one condition had been attached: "Only that we should remember the poor; which very thing I also was forward to do." As one condition is here mentioned, why not the others, had any been actually imposed? It is argued that the remembrance of the poor of Jerusalem which is thus inculcated was a recommendation personally made to Paul and Barnabas; but it is clear that the Apostle's words refer to the result of his communication of his Gospel, and to the understanding under which his mission to the Gentiles was tolerated.

We have already pointed out how extraordinary it is that such a decision of the Council should not have been referred to in describing his visit, and the more we go into details the more striking and inexplicable, except in one way, is such silence. In relating the struggle regarding the circumcision of Titus, for instance, and stating that he did not yield, no, not for an hour, to the demands made on the subject, is it conceivable that, if the exemption of all Gentile Christians from the initiatory rite had been unanimously conceded, Paul would not have added to his statement about Titus, that not only he himself had not been compelled to give way in this instance, but that his representations had even convinced those who had been Apostles before him, and secured the unanimous adoption of his own views on the point? The whole of this Epistle is a vehement and intensely earnest denunciation of those Judaisers who were pressing the necessity of the initiatory rite upon the Galatian converts.[3] Is it possible that

[1] Gal. i. 8, 9. [2] *Ib.*, i. 6, 7.

[3] "Turning from Antioch to Galatia, we meet with Judaic teachers who urged circumcision on the Gentile converts, and, as the best means of weakening the authority of St. Paul, asserted for the Apostles of the Circumcision the exclusive right of dictating to the Church" (Lightfoot, *Ep. to the Gal.*, p. 353).

the Apostle could have left totally unmentioned the fact that the Apostles and the very Church of Jerusalem had actually declared circumcision to be unnecessary? It would not have accorded with Paul's character, it is said, to have appealed to the authority of the elder Apostles or of the Church in a matter in which his own apostolic authority and teaching were in question. In that case, how can it be supposed that he ever went at all up to Jerusalem to the Apostles and elders about this question? If he was not too proud to lay aside his apostolic dignity and, representing the Christians of Antioch, to submit the case to the Council at Jerusalem, and subsequently to deliver its decree to various communities, is it consistent with reason or common sense to assert that he was too proud to recall the decision of that Council to the Christians of Galatia? It must, we think, be obvious that, if such an explanation of Paul's total silence as to the decree be at all valid, it is absolutely fatal to the account of Paul's visit in the Acts. This reasoning is not confined to the Epistle to the Galatians, but, as Paley points out, applies to the other Epistles of Paul, in all of which the same silence is preserved.

Moreover, the apologetic explanation altogether fails upon other grounds. Without appealing to the decree as an authority, we must feel sure that the Apostle would at least have made use of it as a logical refutation of his adversaries. The man who did not hesitate to attack Peter openly for inconsistency, and charge him with hypocrisy, would not have hesitated to cite the decree as evidence, and still less to fling it in the faces of those Judaisers who, so short a time after that decree is supposed to have been promulgated, preached the necessity of circumcision and Mosaic observances in direct opposition to its terms, whilst claiming to represent the views of the very Apostles and Church which had framed it. Paul, who never denies the validity of their claim, would most certainly have taunted them with gross inconsistency and retorted that the Church of Jerusalem, the Apostles, and the Judaisers who now troubled him and preached circumcision and the Mosaic law had, four or five years previously, declared, as the deliberate decision of the Holy Spirit and the Council, that they were no longer binding on the Gentile converts. By such a reference "the discussion would have been foreclosed." None of the reasons which are suggested to explain the undeniable fact that there is no mention of the decree can really bear examination, and that fact remains supported by a great many powerful considerations, leading to the very simple explanation which reconciles all difficulties, that the narrative of the Acts is not authentic.

We arrive at the very same results when we examine the Apostle's references to the practices which the conditions of the decree were

intended to control. Instead of recognising the authority of the decree or enforcing its prescriptions, he does not even allow us to infer its existence, and he teaches disregard at least of some of its restrictions. The decree enjoins the Gentile Christians to abstain from meats offered to idols. Paul tells the Corinthians to eat whatever meat is sold in the shambles without asking questions for conscience sake, for an idol is nothing in the world, "neither if we eat are we the better, nor if we eat not are we the worse."[1] It is not conceivable that the Apostle could so completely have ignored the prohibition of the decree if he had actually submitted the question to the Apostles, and himself so distinctly acquiesced in their decision as to distribute the document amongst the various communities whom he subsequently visited. To argue that the decree was only intended to have force in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia, to which, as the locality in which the difficulty had arisen which had originally led to the Council, the decree was, in the first instance, addressed, is highly arbitrary; but when, proceeding further, Apologists[2] draw a distinction between those churches "which had already been founded, and which had felt the pressure of Jewish prejudice (Acts xvi. 4)," and "brotherhoods afterwards formed and lying beyond the reach of such influences," as a reason why no notice of the decree is taken in the case of the Corinthians and Romans, the special pleading ignores very palpable facts. "Jewish prejudices" are represented in the Acts of the Apostles themselves as being more than usually strong in Corinth. There was a Jewish synagogue there, augmented probably by the Jews expelled from Rome under Claudius,[3] and their violence against Paul finally obliged him to leave the place.[4] Living in the midst of an idolatrous city, and much exposed to the temptations of sacrificial feasts, we might naturally expect excessive rigour against participation, on the one hand, and perhaps too great indifference, on the other; and this we actually find to have been the case. It is in consequence of questions respecting meats offered to idols that Paul writes to the Corinthians, and, whilst treating the matter in itself as one of perfect indifference, merely inculcates consideration for weak consciences.[5] It is clear that there was a decided feeling against the practice; it is clear that strong Jewish prejudices existed in the Jewish colony at Corinth, and wherever there were Jews the eating of meats offered to idols was an abomination. The sin of Israel at Baalpeor[6] lived in the memory of the people, and abstinence from such pollution[7] was considered a duty. If the existence of such "Jewish prejudices" was a reason for

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 4 f., x. 25 f. [2] Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Ep. to the Gal.*, p. 126 f.
[3] Acts xviii. 2. [4] *Ib.*, xviii. 6, 12 f. [5] 1 Cor. viii. 1–13, x. 23 f.
[6] Numb. xxv. 2 f.; Psalm cvi. 28. [7] Dan. i. 8 f.

publishing the decree, we have, in fact, more definite evidence of them in Corinth than we have in Antioch, for, apart from this specific mention of the subject of eating sacrificial meats, the two Apostolic letters abundantly show the existence and activity of Judaistic parties there, which opposed the work of Paul, and desired to force Mosaic observances upon his converts. It is impossible to admit that, supposing such a decree to have been promulgated as the mind of the Holy Spirit, there could be any reason why it should have been unknown at Corinth so short a time after it was adopted. When, therefore, we find the Apostle not only ignoring it, but actually declaring that to be a matter of indifference, abstinence from which it had just seemed good to the Holy Spirit to enjoin, the only reasonable conclusion is that Paul himself was totally ignorant of the existence of any decree containing such a prohibition. There is much difference of opinion as to the nature of the πορνεία referred to in the decree, and we need not discuss it; but in all the Apostle's homilies upon the subject there is the same total absence of all allusion to the decision of the Council.

Nowhere can any practical result from the operation of the decree be pointed out, nor any trace even of its existence. The assertions and conjectures, by which those who maintain the authenticity of the narrative in the Acts seek to explain the extraordinary absence of all external evidence of the decree, labour under the disadvantage of all attempts to account for the total failure of effects from a supposed cause, the existence of which is in reality only assumed. It is customary to reply to the objection that there is no mention of the decree in the Epistles of Paul, or in any other contemporary writing, that this is a mere argument *a silentio*. Is it not, however, difficult to imagine any other argument, from contemporary sources, regarding what is affirmed to have had no existence, than that from silence? Do Apologists absolutely demand that, with prophetic anticipation of future controversies, the Apostle Paul should obligingly have left on record that there actually was no Council such as a writer would subsequently describe, and that the decree which he would put forward as the result of that Council must not be accepted as genuine? It is natural to expect that, when writing of the very visit in question, and dealing with subjects and discussions in which, whether in the shape of historical allusion, appeal to authority, taunt for inconsistency, or assertion of his own influence, some allusion to the decree would have been highly appropriate, if not necessary, the Apostle Paul should at least have given some hint of its existence. His not doing so constitutes strong presumptive evidence against the authenticity of the decree, and all the more so as no more positive evidence than silence could possibly be forthcoming of the non-existence of

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

that which never existed. The supposed decree of the Council of Jerusalem cannot on any ground be accepted as a historical fact.

We may now return to such further consideration of the statements of the Epistle as may seem necessary for the object of our inquiry. No mention is made by the Apostle of any official mission on the subject of circumcision, and the discussion of that question arises in a merely incidental manner from the presence of Titus, an uncircumcised Gentile Christian. There has been much discussion as to whether Titus actually was circumcised or not, and there can be little doubt that the omission of the negative οἷς οὐδέ from Gal. ii. 5 has been in some cases influenced by the desire to bring the Apostle's conduct upon this occasion into harmony with the account, in Acts xvi. 3, of his circumcising Timothy. We shall not require to enter into any controversy on the point, for the great majority of critics are agreed that the Apostle intended to say that Titus was not circumcised, although the contrary is affirmed by a few writers. It is obvious from the whole of the Apostle's narrative that great pressure was exerted to induce Titus to submit, and that Paul, if he did not yield even for an hour the required subjection, had a long and severe struggle to maintain his position. Even when relating the circumstances in his letter to the Galatians, the recollection of his contest profoundly stirs the Apostle's indignation; his utterance becomes vehement, but cannot keep pace with his impetuous thoughts; and the result is a narrative in broken and abrupt sentences, whose very incompleteness is eloquent, and betrays the irritation which has not even yet entirely subsided. How does this accord with the whole tone of the account in the Acts? It is customary with Apologists to insert so much between the lines of that narrative, partly from imagination and partly from the statements of the Epistle, that they almost convince themselves and others that such additions are actually suggested by the author of the Acts himself. If we take the account of the Acts without such transmutations, it is certain that not only is there not the slightest indication of any struggle regarding the circumcision of Titus, "in which St. Paul maintained at one time almost single-handed the cause of Gentile freedom,"[1] but no suggestion that there had ever been any hesitation on the part of the leading Apostles and the mass of the Church regarding the point at issue. The impression given by the author of the Acts is undeniably one of unbroken and undisturbed harmony: of a Council in which the elder Apostles were of one mind with Paul, and warmly agreed with him that the Gentiles should be delivered from the yoke of the Mosaic law and

[1] Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 106.

from the necessity of undergoing the initiatory rite. What is there in such an account to justify in any degree the irritation displayed by Paul at the mere recollection of this visit, or to merit the ironical terms with which he speaks of the "pillar" Apostles?

We may now consider the part which the Apostles must have taken in the dispute regarding the circumcision of Titus. Is it possible to suppose that, if the circumcision of Paul's follower had only been demanded by certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed, unsupported by the rest, there could ever have been any considerable struggle on the point? Is it possible, further, to suppose that, if Paul had received the cordial support of James and the leading Apostles in his refusal to concede the circumcision of Titus, such a contest could have been more than momentary and trifling? Is it possible that the Apostle Paul could have spoken of "certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed" in such terms as: "to whom we yielded by the submission (εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ), no, not for an hour";[1] or that he could have used this expression if those who pressed the demand upon him had not been in a position of authority, which naturally suggested a subjection which Paul upon this occasion persistently refused? It is not possible. Of course many writers who seek to reconcile the two narratives, and some of whom substitute, for the plain statements of the Acts and of the Apostle, an account which is not consistent with either, suppose that the demand for the circumcision of Titus proceeded solely from the "false brethren," although some of them suppose that at least these false brethren may have thought they had reason to hope for the support of the elder Apostles.[2] It is almost too clear for dispute that the desire that Titus should be circumcised was shared or pressed by the elder Apostles. According to the showing of the Acts, nothing could be more natural than the fact that James and the elders of Jerusalem who, so long after (xxi. 20 f.), advised Paul to prove his continued observance of the law, and that he did not teach the Jews to abandon circumcision, should on this occasion have pressed him to circumcise Titus. The conduct of Peter at Antioch, and the constant opposition which Paul met with from emissaries of James and of the Apostles of the Circumcision upon the very point of Gentile circumcision, all support the inevitable conclusion, that the pressure upon Paul in the matter of Titus was not only not resisted by the Apostles, but proceeded in no small degree from them.

[1] Gal. ii. 5.

[2] Wieseler (*Chron. ap. Zeit.*, p. 194) conjectures the meaning of Paul to be that, but for the false brethren, he would actually have circumcised Titus, and thus have been consistent with the principles which he maintained by the circumcision of Timothy, xvi. 3.

This is further shown by the remainder of Paul's account of his visit and by the tone of his remarks regarding the principal Apostles, as well as by the historical data which we possess of his subsequent career. We need not repeat that the representation in the Acts both of the Council and of the whole intercourse between Paul and the Apostles is one of "unbroken unity."[1] The struggle about Titus and the quarrel with Peter at Antioch are altogether omitted, and the Apostolic letter speaks merely of "our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have given up their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."[2] The language of Paul is not so pacific and complimentary. Immediately after his statement that he had "yielded by the submission, no, not for an hour," Paul continues: "But from those who seem to be something (ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι)—whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth not man's person—for to me those who seem (οἱ δοκοῦντες) (to be something) communicated nothing, but, on the contrary, etc., and when they knew the grace that was given to me, James and Cephas and John, who seem to be pillars (οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι), gave to me and Barnabas right hands of fellowship that we (should go) unto the Gentiles," etc.[3] The tone and language of this passage are certainly depreciatory of the elder Apostles, and, indeed, it is difficult to understand how any one could fail to perceive and admit the fact. It is argued by some, who recognise the irony of the term οἱ δοκοῦντες applied to the Apostles, that the disparagement which is so transparent in the form οἱ δοκοῦντες εἶναί τι, "those who seem to be something," is softened again in the new turn which is given to it in verse 9, οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι, "these who seem to be pillars," in which, it is said, "the Apostle expresses the real greatness and high authority of the twelve in their separate field of labour."[4] It seems to us that this interpretation cannot be sustained. Paul is ringing the changes on οἱ δοκοῦντες, and contrasting with the position they assumed, and the estimation in which they were held, his own experience of them and their inability to add anything to him. "Those who seem to be something," he commences, but immediately interrupts himself, after having thus indicated the persons whom he meant, with the more direct protest of irritated independence: "whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth not man's person." These δοκοῦντες communicated nothing to him, but, on the contrary, when they knew the grace given to him, "those who seem to be pillars" gave him hands of fellowship, but nothing more, and they went their different ways, he to the Gentiles and

[1] Jowett, *The Eps. of St. Paul*, i., p. 330. [2] Acts xv. 25 f.
[3] Gal. ii. 6, 9. [4] Jowett, *The Eps. of St. Paul*, i., p. 331.

they to the circumcision. If the expression *οἱ δοκ. στῦλοι εἶναι* be true, as well as ironically used, it cannot be construed into a declaration of respect, but forms part of a passage whose tone throughout is proudly depreciatory. This is followed by such words as "hypocrisy" (*ὑπόκρισις*) and "condemned" (*κατεγνωσμένος*) applied to the conduct of Peter at Antioch, as well as the mention of the emissaries of James as the cause of that dispute, which add meaning to the irony. This is not the only occasion on which Paul betrays a certain bitterness against the elder Apostles. In his second letter to the Corinthians, xi. 5, he says, "For I reckon that I am not a whit behind the over much Apostles" (*τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων*), and again, xii. 11, "For in nothing was I behind the over much Apostles" (*τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων*); and the whole of the vehement passage in which these references are set shows the intensity of the feeling which called them forth. To say that the expressions in the Galatian Epistle and here are "depreciatory, not indeed of the twelve themselves, but of the extravagant and exclusive claims set up for them by the Judaisers,"[1] is an extremely arbitrary distinction. They are directly applied to the Apostles, and *οἱ δοκοῦντες εἶναί τι* cannot be taken as irony against those who over-estimated them, but against the *δοκοῦντες* themselves. Paul's blows generally go straight to their mark.

Meyer argues that the designation of the Apostles as *οἱ δοκοῦντες* is purely historical, and cannot be taken as ironical, inasmuch as it would be inconsistent to suppose that Paul could adopt a depreciatory tone when he is relating his recognition as a colleague by the elder Apostles;[2] and others consider that verses 8, 9, 10 contain evidence of mutual respect and recognition between Paul and the Twelve. Even if this were so it could not do away with the actual irony of the expressions; but do the facts support such a statement? We have seen that, in spite of the picture of unbroken unity drawn by the author of the Acts and the liberal sentiments regarding the Gentiles which he puts into the mouth of Peter and of James, Paul had a severe and protracted struggle to undergo in order to avoid circumcising Titus. We have already stated the grounds upon which it seems certain that the pressure upon that occasion came as well from the elder Apostles as the "false brethren," and critics who do not go so far as to make this positive affirmation, at least recognise the passive, and, therefore, to a large extent, compliant, attitude which the Apostles must have held. It is after narrating some of the particulars of this struggle that Paul uses the terms of depreciation which we have

[1] Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 107.

[2] *Kr. Ex. H'buch üb. d. Br. an die Gal.*, 63 f.

been discussing; and, having added, "for to me those who seem (to be something) communicated nothing," he says, "*but, on the contrary*, when they saw that I have been entrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision, even as Peter with that of the circumcision (for he that wrought for Peter unto the Apostleship of the circumcision wrought also for me unto the Gentiles); and when they knew the grace that was given unto me, James and Cephas and John, who seem to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas right hands of fellowship, that we (should go) unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision—only that we should remember the poor; which very thing I also was forward to do." It will be observed that, after saying they "communicated nothing" to him, the Apostle adds, in opposition, "but, on the contrary" (*ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον*). In what did this opposition consist? Apparently in this—that, instead of strengthening the hands of Paul, they left him to labour alone. They said: "Take your own course; preach the Gospel of the uncircumcision to Gentiles, and we will preach the Gospel of the circumcision to Jews."[1] In fact, when Paul returned to Jerusalem for the second time after fourteen years, he found the elder Apostles not one whit advanced towards his own universalism; they retained their former Jewish prejudices, and remained, as before, Apostles of the circumcision. Notwithstanding the strong Pauline sentiments put into Peter's mouth by the author of the Acts, and his claim to have been so long before selected by God that by his mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe, Paul singles out Peter as specially entrusted with the Gospel of the circumcision; and, in the end, after Paul has exerted all his influence, Peter and the rest remain unmoved, and allow Paul to go to the Gentiles, while they confine their ministry, as before, to the Jews. The success of Paul's work amongst the heathen was too palpable a fact to be ignored; but there is no reason to believe that the conversion of the Gentiles, upon his terms, was more than tolerated at that time, or the Gentile Christians admitted to more than such imperfect communion with the Jewish Christians as that of Proselytes of the Gate in relation to Judaism. This is shown by the conduct of Peter at Antioch after the supposed Council, and of the Jews with him, and even of Barnabas, through fear of the emissaries of James, whose arrival certainly could not have produced a separation between Jewish and Gentile Christians had the latter been recognised as in full communion.

The "hands of fellowship" clearly was a mere passive permission of Paul's mission to the Gentiles, but no positive and hearty approval of it testified by active support. It must, we think, be

[1] Jowett, *The Eps. of St. Paul*, i. 240 f.

evident to any one who attentively considers the passage we are examining, that there is no question in it of a recognition of the Apostolate of Paul. The elder Apostles consent to his mission to the Gentiles, whilst they themselves go to the circumcision; but there is not a syllable which indicates that Paul's claim to the title of Apostle was ever either acknowledged or discussed. It is not probable that Paul would have submitted such a point to their consideration. It is difficult to see how the elder Apostles could well have done less than they did, and the extent of their fellowship seems to have simply amounted to toleration of what they could not prevent. The pressure for the circumcision of the Gentile converts was an attempt to coerce, and to suppress the peculiar principle of the Gospel of uncircumcision; and, though that effort failed through the determined resistance of Paul, it is clear, from the final resolve to limit their preaching to the circumcision, that the elder Apostles in no way abandoned their view of the necessity of the initiatory rite. The episode at Antioch is a practical illustration of this statement. Hilgenfeld ably remarks: "When we consider that Peter was afraid of the circumcised Christians, there can be no doubt *that James, at the head of the primitive community, made the attempt to force heathen Christians to adopt the substance of Jewish legitimacy, by breaking off ecclesiastical community with them.*"[1] The Gentile Christians were virtually excommunicated on the arrival of the emissaries of James, or at least treated as mere Proselytes of the Gate; and the pressure upon the Galatian converts of the necessity of circumcision by similar Judaising emissaries, which called forth the vehement and invaluable Epistle before us, is quite in accordance with the circumstances of this visit. The separation agreed upon between Paul and the elder Apostles was not in any sense geographical, but purely ethnological. It was no mere division of labour,[2] no suitable apportionment of work. The elder Apostles determined, like their Master before them, to confine their ministry to Jews, whilst Paul, if he pleased, might go to the Gentiles; and the fact that Peter subsequently goes to Antioch, as well as many other circumstances, shows that no mere separation of localities, but a selection of race, was intended. If there had not been this absolute difference of purpose, any separation would have been unnecessary, and all the Apostles would have preached one Gospel indifferently to all who had ears to hear it; such strange inequality in the partition of the work could never have existed: that Paul should go unaided to the gigantic task of converting the

[1] *Zeitschr. wiss. Th.*, 1858, p. 90.

[2] "They would sanction but not share his mission to the Gentiles" (Jowett, *The Eps. of St. Paul*, i. 236).

heathen, while the Twelve reserved themselves for the small but privileged people. All that we have said at the beginning of this section of the nature of primitive Christianity, and of the views prevalent amongst the disciples at the death of their Master, is verified by this attitude of the Three during the famous visit of the Apostle of the Gentiles to Jerusalem, and Paul's account is precisely in accordance with all that historical probability and reason, unwarped by the ideal representations of the Acts, prepare us to expect. The more deeply we go into the statements of Paul the more is this apparent, and the more palpable does the inauthenticity of the narrative of the Council appear.

The words of Paul in describing the final understanding are very remarkable, and require further consideration. The decision that they should go to the circumcision and Paul to the Gentiles is based upon the recognition of a different Gospel entrusted to him, the Gospel of the uncircumcision, as the Gospel of the circumcision is entrusted to Peter. It will be remembered that Paul states that, on going up to Jerusalem upon this occasion, he communicated to them the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, and it is probable that he made the journey more especially for this purpose. It appears from the account that this Gospel was not only new to them, but was distinctly different from that of the elder Apostles. If Paul preached the same Gospel as the rest, what necessity could there have been for communicating it at all? What doubt that by any means he might be running, or had run, in vain? He knew perfectly well that he preached a different Gospel from the Apostles of the Circumcision, and his anxiety probably was to secure an amicable recognition of the Gentile converts, whom he had taught to consider circumcision unnecessary and the obligation of the law removed. Of course there was much that was fundamentally the same in the two Gospels, starting as they both did with the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah; but their points of divergence were very marked and striking, and more especially in directions where the prejudices of the Apostles of the circumcision were the strongest. Avoiding all debatable ground, it is clear that the Gospel of the uncircumcision, which proclaimed the abrogation of the law and the inutility of the initiatory rite, must have been profoundly repugnant to Jews, who still preached the obligation of circumcision and the observance of the law. "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law,"[1] said the Gospel of the uncircumcision. "Behold, I, Paul, say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing.....For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love."[2] "For neither circumcision is anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."[3] The teaching

[1] Gal. iii. 13. [2] *Ib.*, v. 2, 6. [3] *Ib.*, vi. 15.

which was specially designated the Gospel of the circumcision, in contradistinction to this Gospel of the uncircumcision, held very different language. There is no gainsaying the main fact—and that fact, certified by Paul himself and substantiated by a host of collateral circumstances, is more conclusive than all conciliatory apologetic reasoning—that, at the date of this visit to Jerusalem (c. A.D. 50–52), the Three, after hearing all that Paul had to say, allowed him to go alone to the Gentiles, but themselves would have no part in the mission, and turned as before to the circumcision.

There is another point to which we must very briefly refer. The statements of Paul show that, antecedent to this visit to Jerusalem, Paul had been the active Apostle of the Gentiles, preaching his Gospel of the uncircumcision, and that subsequently he returned to the same field of labour. If we examine the narrative of the Acts, we do not find him represented in any special manner as the Apostle of the Gentiles; but, on the contrary, whilst Peter claims the honour of having been selected that by his voice the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe, Paul is everywhere described as going to the Jews, and only when his teaching is rejected by them does he turn to the Gentiles. It is true that Ananias is represented as being told by the Lord that Paul is a chosen vessel "to bear my name both before Gentiles and kings, and the sons of Israel";[1] and Paul subsequently recounts how the Lord had said to himself, "Go, for I will send thee far hence unto Gentiles."[2] The author of the Acts, however, everywhere conveys the impression that Paul very reluctantly fulfils this mission, and that if he had but been successful amongst the Jews he never would have gone to the Gentiles at all. Immediately after his conversion, he preaches in the synagogues at Damascus and confounds the Jews,[3] as he again does during his visit to Jerusalem.[4] When the Holy Spirit desires the Church at Antioch to separate Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto he has called them, they continue to announce the word of God "in the synagogues of the Jews,"[5] and in narrating the conversion of the Roman proconsul at Paphos it is said that it is Sergius Paulus himself who calls for Barnabas and Saul, and seeks to hear the word of God.[6] When they came to Antioch in Pisidia they go into the synagogue of the Jews[7] as usual, and it is only after the Jews reject them that Paul and Barnabas are described as saying: "It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you: seeing that ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles."[8]

[1] ix. 15 f. [2] xxii. 21; cf. xxvi. 17 f. [3] ix. 20, 22.
[4] ix. 28 f. [5] xiii. 5. [6] xiii. 7. [7] xiii. 14 f., 42 f. [8] xiii. 46.

In Iconium, to which they next proceed, however, they go into the synagogue of the Jews,[1] and later it is stated that Paul, on arriving at Thessalonica, "as his custom was," went into the synagogue of the Jews, and for three Sabbaths discoursed to them.[2] At Corinth it was only when the Jews opposed him and blasphemed that Paul is represented as saying: "Your blood be upon your own head; I will henceforth, with a pure conscience, go unto the Gentiles." It is impossible to distinguish from this narrative any difference between the ministry of Paul and that of the other Apostles. They all address themselves mainly and primarily to the Jews, although, if Gentiles desire to eat of "the crumbs which fall from the children's bread," they are not rejected. Even the Pharisees stirred heaven and earth to make proselytes. In no sense can the Paul of the Acts be considered specially an Apostle of the Gentiles, and the statement of the Epistle to the Galatians[3] has no significance, if interpreted by the historical work.

Apologists usually reply to this objection that the practice of Paul in the Acts is in accordance with his own words in the Epistle to the Romans, i. 16, in which it is asserted he recognises the right of the Jews to precedence. In the authorised version this passage is rendered as follows: "For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek."[4] (*δύναμις γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι.*) As a matter of fact, we may here at once state that the word *πρῶτον*, "first," is not found in Codices B and G, and that it is omitted from the Latin rendering of the verse quoted by Tertullian.[5] That the word upon which the controversy turns should not be found in so important a MS. as the *Vatican Codex*, or in so ancient a version as Tertullian's, is very significant; but, proceeding at once to the sense of the sentence, we must briefly state the reasons which seem to us conclusively to show that the usual reading is erroneous. The passage is an emphatic statement of the principles of Paul. He declares that he is not ashamed of the Gospel, and he immediately states the reason: "for it is a power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth."[6] He is not ashamed of the Gospel, because he recognises its universality; for, in opposition to the exclusiveness of Judaism, he maintains that all are "sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus.....There is neither Jew nor Greek

[1] xiv. 1 f. [2] xvii. 1 f. Cf. 10 f., 17 f.; xviii. 4 f., 19, 28; xix. 8.
[3] Gal. ii. 9.
[4] Cf. Rom. ii. 9, 10. The oldest MSS. and versions omit the *τοῦ χριστοῦ* of the Authorised Version, which most editors, therefore, reject.
[5] *Adv. Marc.*, v. 13. [6] Rom. i. 16.

.....for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise."[1] "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love."[2] The reason which he gives is that which lies at the basis of his special teaching; but we are asked to believe that, after so clear and comprehensive a declaration, he at once adds the extraordinary qualification: Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι, rendered "to the Jew first and also to the Greek." What is the meaning of such a limitation? If the Gospel be a power of God unto salvation "to everyone that believeth" (παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι), in what manner can it possibly be so "to the Jew first"? Can it be maintained that there are comparative degrees in salvation? "Salvation" is obviously an absolute term. If saved at all, the Jew cannot be more saved than the Greek. If, on the other hand, the expression be interpreted as an assertion that the Jew has a right of precedence, either in the offer or the attainment of salvation, before the Greek, the manner of its realisation is almost equally inconceivable, and a host of difficulties, especially in view of the specific Pauline teaching, immediately present themselves. There can be no doubt that the Judaistic view distinctly was that Israel must first be saved before the heathen could obtain any part in the Messianic kingdom, and we have shown that this idea dominated primitive Christianity; and inseparable from this was the belief that the only way to a participation in its benefits lay through Judaism. The heathen could only obtain admission into the family of Israel, and become partakers in the covenant, by submitting to the initiatory rite. It was palpably under the influence of this view, and with a conviction that the Messianic kingdom was primarily destined for the children of Israel, that the elder Apostles, even after the date of Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, continued to confine their ministry "to the circumcision." Paul's view was very different. He recognised and maintained the universality of the Gospel, and, in resolving to go to the heathen, he practically repudiated the very theory of Jewish preference which he is here supposed to advance. If the Gospel, instead of being a power of God to salvation to every man who believed, was for the Jew first, the Apostolate of the Gentiles was a mere delusion and a snare. What could be the advantage of so urgently offering salvation to the Greek, if the gift, instead of being "for every one that believeth," was a mere prospective benefit, inoperative until the Jew had first been saved? "Salvation to the Jew first and also to the Greek," if it have any significance whatever of the kind argued involving either a prior claim to the offer of salvation or

[1] Gal. iii. 26 f. [2] *Ib.*, v. 6.

precedence in its distribution—so completely destroys all the present interest in it of the Gentile, that the Gospel must to him have lost all power. To suppose that such an expression simply means that the Gospel must first be preached to the Jews in any town to which the Apostle might come, before it could legitimately be proclaimed to the Gentiles of that town, is childish. We have no reason to suppose that Paul held the deputy Sergius Paulus, who desired to hear the word of God and believed, in suspense until the Jews of Paphos had rejected it. The cases of the Ethiopian eunuch and Cornelius throw no light upon any claim of the Jew to priority in salvation. Indeed, not to waste time in showing the utter incongruity of the ordinary interpretation, we venture to affirm that there is not a single explanation, which maintains a priority assigned to the Jew in any way justifying the reference to this text, which is capable of supporting the slightest investigation. If we linguistically examine the expression Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι, we arrive at the same conclusion, that πρῶτον is an interpolation, for we must maintain that πρῶτον with τε and καὶ must be applied equally both to "Jew" and "Greek," and cannot rightly be appropriated to the Jew only, as implying a preference over the Greek. The sense, therefore, can only be properly and intelligibly given by disregarding πρῶτον and simply translating the words, "both to Jew and Greek."[1] This was the rendering of the ancient Latin version quoted by Tertullian in his work against Marcion: "*Itaque et hic, cum dicit: Non enim me pudet evangelii, virtus enim dei est in salutem omni credenti, Judæo et Græco, quia justitia dei in eo revelatur ex fide in fidem.*"[2] We are not left without further examples of the very same expression, and an examination of the context will amply demonstrate that Paul used it in no other sense. In the very next chapter the Apostle twice uses the same words. After condemning the hasty and unrighteous judgment of man, he says: "For we know that the judgment of God is according to truth.....who will render to every one according to his works; to them who by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honour and incorruption, eternal life: but unto them that act out of factious spirit and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, anger, and wrath: affliction and distress upon every soul of man that worketh evil, both of Jew and of Greek (Ἰουδαίου τε

[1] Beelen rightly interprets this passage in his Commentary on the Romans: "*Sensus ergo est: Evangelii doctrinam non erubesco; est hæc enim* (γὰρ) *Dei salvifica quædam vis cuicumque qui credit* (παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. *Dativus commodi*), *sive Judæus sit, sive Gentilis*" (*Comment. in Epist. S. Pauli ad Romanos*, 1854, p. 23). So also Lipsius, *Protestanten Bibel*, 1874, p. 494. Lachmann puts the word πρῶτον between brackets.

[2] *Adv. Marc.* v. 13.

(πρῶτον) καὶ Ἕλληνος, A. V. "of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile"); but glory and honour and peace to every one that worketh good, both to Jew and to Greek (Ἰουδαίῳ τε (πρῶτον) καὶ Ἕλληνι, A. V. 'to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile"). For there is no respect of persons with God."[1] How is it possible that, if the Apostle had intended to assert a priority of any kind accorded to the Jew before the Gentile, he could at the same time have added, "For there is no respect of persons with God"? If salvation be "to the Jew first," there is very distinctly respect of persons with God. The very opposite, however, is repeatedly and emphatically asserted by Paul in this very epistle. "For there is no difference between Jew and Greek" (οὐ γάρ ἐστιν διαστολὴ Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἕλληνος), he says, "for the same Lord of all is rich unto all them that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."[2] Here we have the phrase without πρῶτον. Nothing could be more clear and explicit. The precedence of the Jew is directly excluded. At the end of the second chapter, moreover, he explains his idea of a Jew: "For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outwardly in flesh, but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is of the heart, in spirit not letter."[3] If anything further were required to prove that the Apostle does not by the expression, Ἰουδαίῳ τε (πρῶτον) καὶ Ἕλληνι, intend to indicate any priority accorded to the Jew, it is supplied by the commencement of the third chapter. "What, then, is the advantage of the Jew? or what the profit of circumcision?" It is obvious that, if the Apostle had just said that the Gospel was the power of God unto salvation, "to Jew first and also to Greek," he had stated a very marked advantage to the Jew, and that such an inquiry as the above would have been wholly unnecessary. The answer which he gives to his own question, however, completes our certainty. "Much every way," he replies; but in explaining what the "much" advantage was, we hear no more of "to Jew first": "Much every way: for first indeed they were entrusted with the oracles of God."[4] And, after a few words, he proceeds: "What then? are we better? Not at all; for we before brought the charge that both Jews and Greeks (Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας) are all under sin."[5] Here, again, there is no πρῶτον. There can be no doubt in the mind of anyone who understands what Paul's teaching was, and what he means by claiming the special title of "Apostle to the Gentiles," that in going "to the heathen" after his visit to Jerusalem, as before it, there was no purpose in his

[1] Rom. ii. 2, 6–11. [2] *Ib.*, x. 12, 13. [3] *Ib.*, ii. 28.
[4] *Ib.*, iii. 1. [5] *Ib.*, iii. 9.

mind to preach to the Jews first, and only on being rejected by them to turn to the Gentiles, as the Acts would have us suppose; but that the principle which regulated his proclamation of the Gospel was that which we have already quoted: "For there is no difference between Jew and Greek; for the same Lord of all is rich unto all them that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."[1]

Still more incongruous is the statement of the Acts that Paul took Timothy and circumcised him because of the Jews. According to this narrative, shortly after the supposed Council of Jerusalem, at which it was decided that circumcision of Gentile converts was unnecessary; immediately after Paul had, in spite of great pressure, refused to allow Titus to be circumcised; and after it had been agreed between the Apostle of the Gentiles and James and Cephas and John that, while they should go to the circumcision, he, on the contrary, should go to the heathen, Paul actually took and circumcised Timothy. Apologists, whilst generally admitting the apparent contradiction, do not consider that this act involves any real inconsistency, and find reasons which, they affirm, sufficiently justify it. Some of these we shall presently examine, but we may at once say that no apologetic arguments seem to us capable of resisting the conclusion arrived at by many independent critics, that the statement of the Acts with regard to Timothy is opposed to all that we know of Paul's views, and that for unassailable reasons it must be pronounced unhistorical. The author of the Acts says: "And he (Paul) came to Derbe and Lystra. And behold a certain disciple was there, named Timothy, son of a believing Jewish woman, but of a Greek father; who was well reported of by the brethren in Lystra and Iconium. Him would Paul have to go forth with him; and took and circumcised him because of the Jews which were in those places (*καὶ λαβὼν περιέτεμεν αὐτὸν διὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς ὄντας ἐν τοῖς τόποις ἐκείνοις*); for they all knew that his father was a Greek (*ᾔδεισαν γὰρ ἅπαντες ὅτι Ἕλλην ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ὑπῆρχεν*)."[2] The principal arguments of those who maintain the truth and consistency of this narrative briefly are: Paul resisted the circumcision of Titus because he was a Greek, and because the subject then actually under consideration was the immunity from the Jewish rite of Gentile Christians, which would have been prejudiced had he yielded the point. On the other hand, Timothy was the son of a Jewish mother, and, whilst there was no principle here in question, Paul circumcised the companion whom he had chosen to accompany him in his missionary journey, both as a recognition of his Jewish

[1] Rom. x. 12, 13. [2] Acts xvi. 1–3.

origin and to avoid offence to the Jews whom they should encounter in the course of their ministry, as well as to secure for him access to the synagogues which they must visit: Paul in this instance, according to all Apologists, putting in practice his own declaration (1 Cor. ix. 19–20): "For being free from all men, I made myself servant unto all that I might gain the more; and unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews."

It must be borne in mind that the author who chronicles the supposed circumcision of Timothy makes no allusion to the refusal of Paul to permit Titus to be circumcised; an omission which is not only singular in itself, but significant when we find him, immediately after, narrating so singular a concession of which the Apostle makes no mention. Of course it is clear that Paul could not have consented to the circumcision of Titus, and we have only to consider in what manner the case of Timothy differed so as to support the views of those who hold that Paul, who would not yield to the pressure brought to bear upon him in the case of Titus, might, quite consistently, so short a time after, circumcise Timothy with his own hand. It is true that the necessity of circumcision for Gentile Christians came prominently into question, during Paul's visit to Jerusalem, from the presence of his uncircumcised follower Titus, and no doubt the abrogation of the rite must have formed a striking part of the exposition of his Gospel, which Paul tells us he made upon this occasion; but it is equally certain that the necessity of circumcision long continued to be pressed by the Judaistic party in the Church. It cannot fairly be argued that, at any time, Paul could afford to relax his determined and consistent attitude as the advocate for the universality of Christianity and the abrogation of a rite, insistence upon which, he had been the first to recognise, would have been fatal to the spread of Christianity. To maintain that he could safely make such a concession of his principles and himself circumcise Timothy, simply because at that precise moment there was no active debate upon the point, is inadmissible; for his Epistles abundantly prove that the topic, if it ever momentarily subsided into stubborn silence, was continually being revived with renewed bitterness. Pauline views could never have prevailed if he had been willing to sacrifice them for the sake of conciliation whenever they were not actively attacked.

The difference of the occasion cannot be admitted as a valid reason; let us, therefore, see whether any difference in the persons and circumstances removes the contradiction. It is argued that such a difference exists in the fact that, whilst Titus was altogether a Gentile, Timothy, on the side of his mother at least, was a Jew; and Thiersch, following a passage quoted by Wetstein, states that,

according to Talmudic prescriptions, the validity of mixed marriages between a Jewess and a Gentile was only recognised upon the condition that the children should be brought up in the religion of the mother. In this case, he argues, Paul merely carried out the requirement of the Jewish law by circumcising Timothy, which others had omitted to do, and thus secured his admission to the Jewish synagogues to which much of his ministry was directed, but from which he would have been excluded had the rite not been performed.[1] Even Meyer, however, in reference to this point, replies that Paul could scarcely be influenced by the Talmudic canon, because Timothy was already a Christian and beyond Judaism.[2] Besides, in point of fact, by such a marriage the Jewess had forfeited Jewish privileges. Timothy, in the eyes of the Mosaic law, was not a Jew, and held, in reality, no better position than the Greek Titus. He had evidently been brought up as a Gentile, and the only question which could arise in regard to him was whether he must first become a Jew before he could be fully recognised as a Christian. The supposition that the circumcision of Timothy, the son of a Greek, after he had actually become a Christian without having passed through Judaism, could secure for him free access to the synagogues of the Jews, may show how exceedingly slight at that time was the difference between the Jew and the Christian, but it also suggests the serious doubt whether the object of the concession, in the mind of the author of the Acts, was not rather to conciliate the Judaic Christians than to represent the act as one of policy towards the unbelieving Jews. The statement of the Acts is that Paul circumcised Timothy "because of the Jews which were in those places; for they all knew that his father was a Greek." If the reason which we are discussing were correct, the expression would more probably have been, "for they knew that his mother was a Jewess." The Greek father might, and probably did, object to the circumcision of his son, but that was no special reason why Paul should circumcise him. On the other hand, the fact that the Jews knew that his father was a Greek made the action attributed to Paul a concession which the author of the Acts thus represented in its most conciliatory light. The circumcision of Timothy was clearly declared unnecessary by the apostolic decree, for the attempt to show that he was legitimately regarded as a Jew utterly fails. It is obvious that, according to Pauline doctrine, there could be no obligation for anyone who adopted Christianity to undergo this initiatory rite.

[1] *Die Kirche im ap. Z.*, 138. Ewald similarly argues that Paul circumcised Timothy to remove the stigma attaching to him as the child of such a mixed marriage (*Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. 445; *Jahrb. Bibl. Wiss.*, 1857-58, ix., p. 64).

[2] *Apostelg.*, p. 354.

It is impossible reasonably to maintain that any case has been made out to explain why Timothy, who had grown into manhood without being circumcised, and had become a Christian whilst uncircumcised, should at that late period be circumcised. Beyond the reference to a Talmudic prescription, in fact, which, even if he knew it, could not possibly have been recognised by Paul as authoritative, there has not been a serious attempt made to show that the case of Timothy presents exceptional features reconciling the contradiction otherwise admitted as apparent.

The whole apologetic argument, in fact, sinks into one of mere expediency: Timothy, the son of a Jewess and of a Greek, and thus having a certain affinity both to Jews and Gentiles, would become a much more efficient assistant to Paul if he were circumcised and thus had access to the Jewish synagogues; therefore Paul, who himself became as a Jew that he might win the Jews, demanded the same sacrifice from his follower. But can this argument bear any scrutiny by the light of Paul's own writings? It cannot. Paul openly claims to be the Apostle of the Gentiles, and just before the period at which he is supposed to circumcise Timothy he parts from the elder Apostles with the understanding that he is to go to the Gentiles who are freed from circumcision. It is a singular commencement of his mission, to circumcise the son of a Greek father after he had become a Christian. Such supposed considerations about access to synagogues and conciliation of the Jews would seem more suitable to a missionary to the circumcision than to the Apostle of the Gentiles. It must be apparent to all that in going more specially to the Gentiles, as he avowedly was, the alleged expediency of circumcising Timothy falls to the ground, and, on the contrary, that such an act would have compromised his whole Gospel. Paul's characteristic teaching was the inutility of circumcision, and upon this point he sustained the incessant attacks of the emissaries of James and the Judaistic party without yielding or compromise. What could have been more ill-advised under such circumstances than the circumcision with his own hands of a convert who, if the son of a Jewess, was likewise the son of a Greek, and had remained uncircumcised until he had actually embraced that faith which, Paul taught, superseded circumcision? The Apostle who declared: "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing,"[1] could not have circumcised the Christian Timothy; and if any utterance of Paul more distinctly and explicitly applicable to the present case be required, it is aptly supplied by the following: "Was any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Hath any man been called in

[1] Gal. v. 2.

uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised.....Let each abide in the same calling wherein he was called."[1]

Apologists quote very glibly the saying of Paul, "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews," as sufficiently justifying the act which we are considering; but it is neither applicable to the case, nor is the passage susceptible of such interpretation. The special object of Paul at that time, according to his own showing,[2] was not to gain Jews, but to gain Gentiles; and the circumcision of Timothy would certainly not have tended to gain Gentiles. If we quote the whole passage from which the above is extracted, the sense at once becomes clear and different from that assigned to it: "For being free from all men, I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more; and unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews; to them under law, as under law, not being myself under law, that I might gain them under law; to them without law, as without law—not being without law to God, but under law to Christ—that I might gain them without law; to the weak I became weak, that I might gain the weak; I am become all things to all men, that I may by all means save some. And all things I do for the Gospel's sake, that I may become a partaker thereof with them."[3] It is clear that a man who could become "all things to all men," in the sense of yielding any point of principle, must be considered without principle at all, and no one could maintain that Paul was apt to concede principles. Judged by his own statements, indeed, his character was the very reverse of this. There is no shade of conciliation when he declares: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach any Gospel unto you other than that we preached unto you, let him be accursed.....For am I now making men my friends, or God? or am I seeking to please men? If I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ."[4] The Gospel of which he speaks, and which he protests "is not after men," but received "through a revelation of Jesus Christ,"[5] is that Gospel which Paul preached among the Gentiles, and which proclaimed the abrogation of the law and of circumcision. Paul might in one sense say that "circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but keeping the commandments of God";[6] but such a statement, simply intended to express that there was neither merit in the one nor in the other, clearly does not apply to the case before us, and no way lessens the force of the words we have quoted above: "If ye be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing." In Paul such a concession would have been in the highest degree a sacrifice of principle, and one which he not only

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 18, 20. [2] Gal. ii. 9. [3] 1 Cor. ix. 19–23.
[4] Gal. i. 8, 10. [5] *Ib.*, i. 11, 12. [6] 1 Cor. vii. 19.

refused to make in the case of Titus, "that the truth of the Gospel might abide," but equally maintained in the face of the pillar Apostles, when he left them and returned to the Gentiles whilst they went back to the circumcision. Paul's idea of being "all things to all men" is illustrated by his rebuke to Peter—once more to refer to the scene at Antioch. Peter apparently practised a little of that conciliation which Apologists, defending the unknown author of the Acts at the expense of Paul, consider to be the sense of the Apostle's words. Paul repudiated such an inference, by withstanding Peter to the face as condemned, and guilty of hypocrisy. Paul became all things to all men by considering their feelings, and exhibiting charity and forbearance, in matters indifferent. He was careful not to make his liberty a stumbling block to the weak. "If food maketh my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh for ever lest I make my brother to offend."[1] Self-abnegation in the use of enlightened liberty, however, is a very different thing from the concession of a rite, which it was the purpose of his whole Gospel to discredit, and the labour of his life to resist. Once more we repeat that the narrative of the Acts regarding the circumcision of Timothy is contradictory to the character and teaching of Paul as ascertained from his Epistles, and, like so many other portions of that work which we have already examined, must be rejected as unhistorical.

We have already tested the narrative of the author of the Acts by the statements of Paul in the first two chapters of the Galatians at such length that, although the subject is far from exhausted, we must not proceed further. We think that there can be no doubt that the *rôle* assigned to the Apostle Paul in Acts xv. is unhistorical, and it is unnecessary for us to point out the reasons which led the writer to present him in such subdued colours. We must, however, before finally leaving the subject, very briefly point out a few circumstances which throw a singular light upon the relations which actually existed between Paul and the elder Apostles, and tend to show their real, if covert, antagonism to the Gospel of the uncircumcision. We may at the outset remark, in reference to an objection frequently made—that Paul does not distinctly refer to the Apostles as opposing his teaching, and does not personally attack them—that such a course would have been suicidal in the Apostle of the Gentiles, whilst on the other hand it could not but have hindered the acceptance of his Gospel, for which he was ever ready to endure so much. The man who wrote, "If it be possible, as much as dependeth on you be at peace with all men,"[2] could well be silent in such a cause. Paul, in venturing to preach the Gospel of the uncircumcision, laboured under the singular

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 13. [2] Rom. xiii. 18.

disadvantage of not having, like the Twelve, been an immediate disciple of the Master. He had been "as the one born out of due time,"[1] and although he claimed that his Gospel had not been taught to him by man, but had been received by direct revelation from Jesus, there can be no doubt that his apostolic position was constantly assailed. The countenance of the elder Apostles, even if merely tacit, was of great importance to the success of his work; and he felt this so much that, as he himself states, he went up to Jerusalem to communicate to them the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, "lest by any means I might be running or did run in vain."[2] Any open breach between them would have frustrated his labours. Had Paul been in recognised enmity with the Twelve who had been selected as his special disciples by the Master, and been repudiated and denounced by them, it is obvious that his position would have been a precarious one. He had no desire for schism. His Gospel, besides, was merely a development of that of the elder Apostles; and, however much they might resent his doctrine of the abrogation of the law and of the inutility of circumcision, they could still regard his Gentile converts as at least in some sort Proselytes of the Gate. With every inducement to preserve peace if by any means possible, and to suppress every expression of disagreement with the Twelve, it is not surprising that we find so little direct reference to the elder Apostles in his epistles. During his visit to Jerusalem he did not succeed in converting them to his views. They still limited their ministry to the circumcision, and he had to be content with a tacit consent to his work amongst the heathen. But although we have no open utterance of his irritation, the suppressed impatience of his spirit, even at the recollection of the incidents of his visit, betrays itself in abrupt sentences, unfinished expressions, and grammar which breaks down in the struggle of repressed emotion. We have already said enough regarding his ironical references to those "who seem to be something," to the "overmuch Apostles," and we need not again point to the altercation between Paul and Cephas at Antioch, and the strong language used by the former.

Nothing is more certain than the fact that, during his whole career, the Apostle Paul had to contend with systematic opposition from the Judaic Christian party; and the only point regarding which there is any difference of opinion is the share in this taken by the Twelve. As we cannot reasonably expect to find any plain statement of this in the writings of the Apostle, we are forced to take advantage of such indications as can be discovered. Upon one point we are not left in doubt. The withdrawal of Peter and the others at Antioch from communion with the Gentile Christians, and, consequently, from the side of Paul, was owing to the arrival

[1] Gal. ii. 2. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 8.

of certain men from James, for the Apostle expressly states so. No surprise is expressed, however, at the effect produced by these τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, and the clear inference is that they represented the views of a naturally antagonistic party an inference which is in accordance with all that we elsewhere read of James. It is difficult to separate the τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου from the τινές of the preceding chapter (i. 7) who "trouble" the Galatians, and "desire to pervert the Gospel of Christ," asserting the necessity of circumcision, against whom the Epistle is directed. Again we meet with the same vague and cautious designation of Judaistic opponents in his second Epistle to the Corinthians (iii. 1), where "some" (τινές) bearers of "letters of commendation" (συστατικῶν ἐπιστολῶν), from persons unnamed, were attacking the Apostle and endeavouring to discredit his teaching. By whom were these letters written? We cannot, of course, give an authoritative reply, but, we may ask, by whom could letters of commendation possessing an authority which could have weight against that of Paul be written, except by the elder Apostles? We have certain evidence in the first Epistle to the Corinthians that parties had arisen in the Church of Corinth in opposition to Paul. These parties were distinguished, as the Apostle himself states, by the cries, "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ"[1] (ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλώ, ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ). Whatever differences of opinion there may be as to the precise nature of these parties, there can be no doubt that both the party "of Cephas" and the party "of Christ" held strong Judaistic views, and assailed the teaching of Paul and his Apostolic authority. It is very evident that the persons to whom the Apostle refers in connection with "letters of commendation" were of these parties.

Apologists argue that "in claiming Cephas as the head of their party they had probably neither more nor less ground than their rivals, who sheltered themselves under the names of Apollos and of Paul."[2] It is obvious, however, that, in a Church founded by Paul, there could have been no party created with the necessity to take his name as their watchword, except as a reply to another party which, having intruded itself, attacked him, and forced those who maintained the views of their own Apostle to raise such a counter cry. The parties "of Cephas" and "of Christ" were manifestly aggressive, intruding themselves, as the Apostle complains, into "other men's labours";[3] and this, in some manner, seems to point to that convention between the Apostle and the

[1] 1 Cor. i. 12.
[2] Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Ep. to the Galatians*, 1874, p. 355.
[3] 2 Cor. x. 13 f.

Three—that he should go to the Gentiles, and they to the circumcision—which, barely more than passive neutrality at the beginning, soon became covertly antagonistic. The fact that the party "of Paul" was not an organised body, so to say, directed by the Apostle as a party leader, in no way renders it probable that the party of Cephas, which carried on active and offensive measures, had not much more ground in claiming Cephas as their head. One point is indisputable, that no party ever claims any man as its leader who is not clearly associated with the views it maintains. The party "of Cephas," representing Judaistic views, opposing the teaching of Paul and joining in denying his Apostolic claims, certainly would not have taken Peter's name as their watch-cry if he had been known to hold and express such Pauline sentiments as are put into his mouth in the Acts, or had not, on the contrary, been intimately identified with Judaistic principles. Religious parties may very probably mistake the delicate details of a leader's teaching, but they can scarcely be wrong in regard to his general principles. If Peter had been so unfortunate as to be flagrantly misunderstood by his followers, and, whilst this party preached in his name Judaistic doctrines and anti-Pauline opinions, the Apostle himself advocated the abrogation of the law as a burden which the Jews themselves were not able to bear, and actively shared Pauline convictions, is it possible to suppose that Paul would not have pointed out the absurdity of such a party claiming such a leader?

The fact is, however, that Paul never denies the claim of those who shelter themselves under the names of Peter and James, never questions their veracity, and never adopts the simple and natural course of stating that, in advancing these names, they are impostors or mistaken. On the contrary, upon all occasions he evidently admits, by his silence, the validity of the claim. We are not left to mere inference that the adopted head actually shared the views of the party. Paul himself distinguishes Peter as the leader of the party of the circumcision in a passage in his letter to the Galatians already frequently referred to,[1] and the episode at Antioch confirms the description, and leaves no doubt that Peter's permanent practice was to force the Gentiles to Judaise. For reasons which we have already stated, Paul could not but have desired to preserve peace, or even the semblance of it, with the elder Apostles, for the Gospel's sake; and he, therefore, wisely leaves them as much as possible out of the question and deals with their disciples. It is obvious that policy must have dictated such a course. By ignoring the leaders and attacking their followers, he suppressed the chief strength of his opponents

[1] Gal. ii. 7 f.

and kept out of sight the most formidable argument against himself—the concurrence with them of the elder Apostles. On the one hand, the Epistles of Paul bear no evidence of any active sympathy and co-operation with his views and work on the part of the elder Apostles. On the other, Paul is everywhere assailed by Judaistic adversaries who oppose his Gospel and deny his Apostleship, and who claim as their leaders the elder Apostles.

If, even without pressing expressions to their extreme and probable point, we take the contrast drawn between his own Gospel and that of the circumcision, the reality of the antagonism must be apparent. "For we are not as the many (οἱ πολλοί[1]) which adulterate the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as of God, before God, speak we in Christ."[2] Later on in the letter, after referring to the intrusion of the opposite party into the circle of his labours, Paul declares that his impatience and anxiety proceed from godly jealousy at the possible effect of the Judaistic intruders upon the Corinthians. "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, your thoughts should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus whom we did not preach, or if ye receive another spirit which ye received not, or another Gospel which ye did not accept, ye bear well with him. For I think I am not a whit behind the overmuch Apostles (τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων)."[3] This reference to the elder Apostles gives point to much of the Epistle that is ambiguous, and more especially when the Judaistic nature of the opposition is so clearly indicated a few verses further on: "Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they Abraham's seed? so am I. Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool), I am more; in labours more abundantly, in prisons exceedingly, in deaths often," etc.[4]

It is argued that the Twelve had not sufficient authority over their followers to prevent such interference with Paul, and that the relation of the Apostle to the Twelve was: "Separation, not opposition, antagonism of the followers rather than of the leaders, personal antipathy of the Judaisers to St Paul, rather than of St. Paul to the Twelve."[5] It is not difficult to believe that the antipathy of Paul to the Judaisers was less than that felt by them

[1] Although this reading is supported by the oldest MSS. such as A, B, C, K, ℵ, and others, the reading οἱ λοιποί, "the rest," stands in D, E, F, G, I, and a large number of other codices, and is defended by many critics as the original, which they argue was altered to οἱ πολλοί, to soften the apparent hardness of such an expression, which would seem to imply that Paul declared himself the sole true exponent of the Gospel.

[2] 2 Cor. ii. 17. [3] *Ib.*, xi. 2–5; cf. Gal. i. 6 f. [4] 2 Cor. xi. 22 f.

[5] Jowett, *The Eps. of St. Paul*, 1855, i., pp. 326, 339.

towards him. The superiority of the man must have rendered him somewhat callous to such dislike.[1] But the mitigated form of difference between Paul and the Twelve here assumed, although still very different from the representations of the Acts, cannot be established, but, on the contrary, must be much widened before it can justly be taken as that existing between Paul and the elder Apostles. We do not go so far as to say that there was open enmity between them, or active antagonism of any distinct character on the part of the Twelve to the Apostle of the Gentiles; but there is every reason to believe that they not only disliked his teaching, but endeavoured to counteract it by their own ministry of the circumcision. They not only did not restrain the opposition of their followers, but they abetted them in their counter-assertion of Judaistic views. Had the Twelve felt any cordial friendship for Paul, and exhibited any active desire for the success of his ministry of the uncircumcision, it is quite impossible that his work could have been so continuously and vexatiously impeded by the persecution of the Jewish Christian party. The Apostles may not have possessed sufficient influence or authority entirely to control the action of adherents, but it would be folly to suppose that, if unanimity of views had prevailed between them and Paul, and a firm and consistent support had been extended to him, such systematic resistance as he everywhere encountered from the party professing to be led by the "pillar" Apostles could have been seriously maintained, or that he could have been left alone and unaided to struggle against it. If the relations between Paul and the Twelve had been such as are intimated in the Acts of the Apostles, his Epistles must have presented undoubted evidence of the fact. Both negatively and positively they testify the absence of all support, and the existence of antagonistic influence on the part of the elder Apostles; and external evidence fully confirms the impression which the Epistles produce.[2]

[1] We do not think it worth while to refer to the argument that the collections made by Paul for the poor of Jerusalem, etc., in times of distress prove the unanimity which prevailed between them. Charity is not a matter of doctrine, and the Good Samaritan does not put the suffering man through his catechism before he relieves his wants.

[2] "Everywhere in the Epistles of St. Paul and in the Acts of the Apostles we find traces of an opposition between the Jew and the Gentile, the circumcision and the uncircumcision. It is found not only in the Epistle to the Galatians, but in a scarcely less aggravated form in the two Epistles to the Corinthians, softened, indeed, in the Epistle to the Romans, and yet distinctly traceable in the Epistle to the Philippians; the party of the circumcision appearing to triumph in Asia, at the very close of the Apostle's life, in the second Epistle to Timothy. In all these Epistles we have proofs of a reaction to Judaism; but, though they are addressed to Churches chiefly of Gentile origin, never of a reaction to heathenism. Could this have been the case unless within the Church itself there had been a Jewish party urging upon the members

From any point of view which may be taken, the Apocalypse is an important document in connection with this point. If it be accepted as a work of the Apostle John—the preponderance of evidence and critical opinion assigns it to him—this book, of course, possesses the greatest value as an indication of his views. If it be merely regarded as a contemporary writing, it still is most interesting as an illustration of the religious feeling of the period. The question is: Does the Apocalypse contain any reference to the Apostle Paul, or throw light upon the relations between him and the elder Apostles? If it do so, and be the work of one of the στῦλοι, nothing obviously could be more instructive. In the messages to the seven churches there are references and denunciations which, in the opinion of many able critics, are directed against the Apostle of the Gentiles and his characteristic teaching. Who but Paul and his followers can be referred to in the Epistle to the Church of Ephesus: "I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and that thou canst not bear wicked persons: and didst try them which say they are Apostles and are not, and didst find them liars"?[1] Paul himself informs us not only of his sojourn in Ephesus, where he believed that "a great and effectual door" was opened to him, but adds, "there are many adversaries" (ἀντικείμενοι πολλοί).[2] The foremost charge brought against the churches is that they have those that hold the teaching of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the sons of Israel, "to eat things offered unto idols."[3] The teaching of

of the Church the performance of a rite repulsive in itself, if not as necessary to salvation, at any rate as a counsel of perfection, seeking to make them in Jewish language, not merely proselytes of the gate, but proselytes of righteousness? What, if not this, is the reverse side of the Epistles of St. Paul? that is to say, the motives, object, or basis of teaching of his opponents, who came with 'epistles of commendation' to the Church of Corinth (2 Cor. iii. 1); who profess themselves 'to be Christ's' in a special sense (2 Cor. x. 7); who say they are of Apollos, or Cephas, or Christ (1 Cor. i. 12); or James (Gal. ii. 12); who preach Christ of contention (Phil. i. 15, 17); who deny St. Paul's authority (1 Cor. ix. 1, Gal. iv. 16); who slander his life (1 Cor. ix. 3, 7). We meet these persons at every turn. Are they the same, or different? Are they mere chance opponents, or do they represent to us one spirit, one mission, one determination to root out the Apostle and his doctrine from the Christian Church? Nothing but the fragmentary character of St. Paul's writings could conceal from us the fact that here was a concerted and continuous opposition" (Jowett, *The Eps. of St. Paul*, i., p. 332 f.).

[1] ii. 2.

[2] 1 Cor. xvi. 9.

[3] Apoc. ii. 14, 20. We do not enter upon the discussion as to the exact interpretation of πορνεῦσαι, always associated with the φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα, regarding which opinions differ very materially. It is probable that the Apocalyptist connected the eating of things offered to idols with actual idolatrous worship. It is not improbable that the maxim of Paul, "all things are lawful unto me" (πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν), 1 Cor. vi. 12, x. 23, may have been abused by his followers; and, in any case, such a sentiment, coupled with Paul's

Paul upon this point is well known, 1 Cor. viii. 1 f., x. 25 f., Rom. xiv. 2 f., and the reference here cannot be mistaken; and when in the Epistle to the Church of Thyatira, after denouncing the teaching "to eat things offered unto idols," the Apocalyptist goes on to encourage those who have not this teaching, "who knew not the depths of Satan (τὰ βάθη τοῦ σατανᾶ),[1] as they say" the expression of Paul himself is taken to denounce his doctrine; for the Apostle, defending himself against the attacks of those parties "of Cephas" and "of Christ" in Corinth, writes: "But God revealed (them) to us through his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, even the depths of God" (τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ)—"the depths of Satan" rather, retorts the Judaistic author of the Apocalypse. τὰ βάθη does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. Again, in the address to the Churches of Smyrna and Philadelphia, when the writer denounces those "who say that they are Jews, and are not, but a synagogue of Satan,"[2] whom has he in view but those Christians whom Paul had taught to consider circumcision unnecessary and the law abrogated? We find Paul, in the Epistle to the Corinthians, so often quoted, obliged to defend himself against these Judaising parties upon this very point: "Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they Abraham's seed? so am I."[3] It is manifest that his adversaries had vaunted their own Jewish origin as a title of superiority over the Apostle of the Gentiles.

We have, however, further evidence of the same attack upon Paul regarding this point. Epiphanius points out that the Ebionites denied that Paul was a Jew, and asserted that he was born of a Gentile father and mother, but that, having gone up to Jerusalem, he became a proselyte and submitted to circumcision in the hope of marrying a daughter of the high priest. But afterwards, according to them, enraged at not securing the maiden for his wife, Paul wrote against circumcision and the Sabbath and the law.[4] The Apostle Paul, whose constant labour it was to destroy the particularism of the Jew and raise the Gentile to full, free, and equal participation with him in the benefits of the New Covenant, could not but incur the bitter displeasure of the Apocalyptist, for whom the Gentiles were, as such, the type of all that was common and unclean. In the utterances of the seer of Patmos we seem to hear the expression of all that

teaching and his abandonment of the Law, must have appeared absolute licence to the Judaistic party. We must also pass over the discussion regarding the signification of "Balaam." The Nicolaitans are not only classed as followers of the teaching of Balaam, but as adherents of Paul.

[1] Apoc., ii. 24. This is the reading of ℵ, P, and some other codices; A, B, C, read τὰ βαθέα.

[2] Apoc., ii. 9, iii. 9. [3] 2 Cor. xi. 22; cf. Philip. iii. 4 f. [4] *Hær.*, xxx. 16.

Judaistic hatred and opposition which pursued the Apostle who laid the axe to the root of Mosaism, and, in his efforts to free Christianity from trammels which, more than any other, retarded its triumphant development, aroused against himself all the virulence of Jewish illiberality and prejudice. The results at which we have arrived might be singularly confirmed by an examination of the writings of the first two centuries, and by observing the attitude assumed towards the Apostle of the Gentiles by such men as Justin Martyr, Papias, Hegesippus, and the author of the *Clementines*; but we have already devoted too much space to this subject, and here we must reluctantly leave it.

The steps by which Christianity was gradually freed from the trammels of Judaism, and became a religion of unlimited range and universal fitness, were clearly not those stated in the Acts of the Apostles. Its emancipation from Mosaism was not effected by any liberal action or enlightened guidance on the part of the elder Apostles. At the death of their Master the Twelve remained closely united to Judaism, and evidently were left without any understanding that Christianity was a new religion which must displace Mosaic institutions, and replace the unbearable yoke of the law by the divine liberty of the Gospel. To the last moment regarding which we have any trustworthy information, the Twelve, as might have been expected, retained all their early religious customs and all their Jewish prejudices. They were simply Jews believing that Jesus was the Messiah; and if the influence of Paul enlarged their views upon some minor points, we have no reason to believe that they ever abandoned their belief in the continued obligation of the law, and the necessity of circumcision for full participation in the benefits of the Covenant. The author of the Acts would have us believe that they required no persuasion, but anticipated Paul in the gospel of uncircumcision.

It is not within the scope of this work to inquire how Paul originally formed his views of Christian universalism. Once formed, it is easy to understand how rapidly they must have been developed and confirmed by experience amongst the Gentiles. Whilst the Twelve still remained in the narrow circle of Judaism and could not be moved beyond the ministry of the circumcision, Paul, in the larger and freer field of the world, must daily have felt more convinced that the abrogation of the law and the abandonment of circumcision were essential to the extension of Christianity amongst the Gentiles. He had no easy task, however, to convince others of this, and he never succeeded in bringing his elder colleagues over to his views. To the end of his life Paul had to contend with bigoted and narrow-minded opposition within the Christian body,

and if his views ultimately triumphed, and the seed which he sowed eventually yielded a rich harvest, he himself did not live to see the day, and the end was attained only by slow and natural changes. The new religion gradually extended beyond the limits of Judaism. Gentile Christians soon outnumbered Jewish believers. The Twelve whose names were the strength of the Judaistic opposition one by one passed away; but, above all, the fall of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Christian community secured the success of Pauline principles and the universalism of Christianity. The Church of Jerusalem could not bear transplanting. In the uncongenial soil of Pella it gradually dwindled away, losing first its influence and, soon after, its nationality. The divided members of the Jewish party, scattered amongst the Gentiles, and deprived of their influential leaders, could not long retard the progress of the liberalism which they still continued to oppose and to misrepresent. In a word, the emancipation of Christianity was not effected by the Twelve, was no work of councils, and no result of dreams; but, receiving its first great impulse from the genius and the energy of Paul, its ultimate achievement was the result of time and natural development.

We have now patiently considered the "Acts of the Apostles," and although it has in no way been our design exhaustively to examine its contents, we have more than sufficiently done so to enable the reader to understand the true character of the document. The author is unknown, and it is no longer possible to identify him. If he were actually the Luke whom the Church indicates, our results would not be materially affected; but the mere fact that the writer is unknown is obviously fatal to the Acts as a guarantee of miracles. A cycle of supernatural occurrences could scarcely, in the estimation of any rational mind, be established by the statement of an anonymous author, and more especially one who not only does not pretend to have been an eye-witness of most of the miracles, but whose narrative is either uncorroborated by other testimony or inconsistent with itself, and contradicted on many points by contemporary documents.

The phenomena presented by the Acts of the Apostles become perfectly intelligible when we recognise that it is the work of a writer living long after the occurrences related, whose pious imagination furnished the Apostolic age with an elaborate system of supernatural agency, far beyond the conception of any other New Testament writer, by which, according to his view, the proceedings of the Apostles were furthered and directed, and the infant Church miraculously fostered. On examining

other portions of his narrative, we find that they present the features which the miraculous elements rendered antecedently probable. The speeches attributed to different speakers are all cast in the same mould, and betray the composition of one and the same writer. The sentiments expressed are inconsistent with what we know of the various speakers, and when we test the circumstances related by previous or subsequent incidents and by trustworthy documents, it becomes apparent that the narrative is not an impartial statement of facts, but a reproduction of legends or a development of tradition, shaped and coloured according to the purpose or the pious views of the writer.

Our comparison of passages of his two works with the writings of the Jewish historian Josephus seems to us to prove that the date at which the author of the third Synoptic and the Acts of the Apostles composed those works must be set at least at the beginning of the second century, and he is thus so far removed from the events which he chronicles that there is ample room, if not necessity, for the exercise of imagination in narrating the career of the Apostles who are supposed to carry on the work of Jesus after his death. In the third Gospel he had, certainly, the records of earlier writers, to whom he refers in his opening lines, to guide him; and here his exaggeration is not so extreme as it became after he proceeded to relate the course of Christianity, when Peter, James, and John extended their missionary labours, and Paul became the eloquent Apostle of the Gentiles. The Acts of the Apostles, composed with more unfettered imagination, bears none of the marks of sober veracity. The Epistles of Paul enable us to correct his statements and to recognise his zealous, but ineffectual, efforts to harmonise the teaching of the elder Apostles, to whom Christianity was still merely a development of Judaism, with the new and enlarged doctrines of the Apostle of the Uncircumcision, which transformed the Mosaic precepts into a universal religion.

Written by an author who was not an eye-witness of the miracles related; who describes events not as they really occurred, but as his pious imagination supposed they ought to have occurred; who seldom touches history without distorting it by legend, until the original elements can scarcely be distinguished; who puts his own words and sentiments into the mouths of the Apostles and other persons of his narrative; and who represents almost every phase of the Church in the Apostolic age as influenced, or directly produced, by supernatural agency such a work is of no value as evidence for occurrences which are in contradiction to all experience. The Acts of the Apostles, therefore, is not only an anonymous work, but upon due examination its claims to be

considered sober and veracious history must be emphatically rejected. It cannot strengthen the foundations of supernatural religion, but, on the contrary, by its profuse and indiscriminate use of the miraculous it discredits miracles, and affords a clearer insight into their origin and fictitious character.

PART V.

THE DIRECT EVIDENCE FOR MIRACLES

CHAPTER I.

THE EPISTLES AND THE APOCALYPSE

Turning from the Acts of the Apostles to the other works of the New Testament, we shall be able very briefly to dispose of the Catholic Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. The so-called Epistles of James, Jude, and John do not contain any evidence which, even supposing them to be authentic, really bears upon our inquiry into the reality of miracles and Divine Revelation; and the testimony of the Apocalypse affects it quite as little. We have already, in examining the fourth Gospel, had occasion to say a good deal regarding both the so-called Epistles of John and the Apocalypse. It is unnecessary to enter upon a more minute discussion of them here. "Seven books of the New Testament," writes Dr. Westcott, "as is well known, have been received into the Canon on evidence less complete than that by which the others are supported."[1] These are "the Epistles of James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse." We have already furnished the means of judging of the nature of the evidence upon which some of the other books have been received into the Canon, and, the evidence for most of these being avowedly "less complete," its nature may be conceived. Works which for a long period were classed amongst the Antilegomena, or disputed books, and which only slowly acquired authority as, in the lapse of time, it became more difficult to examine their claims, could not do much to establish the reality of miracles. With regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews, we may remark that we are freed from any need to deal at length with it, not only by the absence of any specific evidence in its contents, but by the following consideration. If the Epistle be not by Paul —and it not only is not his, but does not even pretend to be so—

[1] *On the Canon*, 4th ed., p. 347.

the author is unknown, and therefore the document has no weight as testimony. On the other hand, if assigned to Paul, we shall have sufficient ground in his genuine Epistles for considering the evidence of the Apostle, and it could not add anything even if the Epistle to the Hebrews were included in the number.

The first Epistle of Peter might have required more detailed treatment, but we think that little could be gained by demonstrating that the document is not authentic, or showing that, in any case, the evidence which it could furnish is not of any value. On the other hand, we are averse to protract the argument by any elaboration of mere details which can be avoided. If it could be absolutely proved that the Apostle Peter wrote the Epistle circulating under his name, the evidence for miracles would only be strengthened by the fact that, incidentally, the doctrine of the Resurrection of Jesus is maintained. No historical details are given, and no explanation of the reasons for which the writer believed in it. Nothing more would be proved than the point that Peter himself believed in the Resurrection. It would certainly be a matter of very deep interest if we possessed a narrative written by the Apostle himself, giving minute and accurate details of the phenomena in consequence of which he believed in so miraculous an event; but since this Epistle does nothing more than allow us to infer the personal belief of the writer, unaccompanied by corroborative evidence, we should not gain anything by accepting it as genuine. We are quite willing to assume, without further examination, that the Apostle Peter in some way believed in the Resurrection of his Master. For the argument regarding the reality of that stupendous miracle, upon which we are about to enter, this is tantamount to assuming the authenticity of the Epistle.

Coming to the Epistles of Paul, it will not be necessary to go into the evidence for the various letters in our New Testament which are ascribed to him, nor shall we require to state the grounds upon which the authenticity of many of them is denied. Accepting the Epistles to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans in the main as genuine compositions of the Apostle, the question as to the origin of the rest, so far as our inquiry is concerned, has little or no interest. From these four letters we obtain the whole evidence of Paul regarding miracles, and this we now propose carefully to examine. One point in particular demands our fullest attention. It is undeniable that Paul preached the doctrine of the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus and believed in those events. Whilst, therefore, we shall not pass over his supposed testimony for the possession of miraculous powers, we shall chiefly devote our attention to his evidence for the central dogmas of Supernatural Religion, the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus. We

shall not limit our examination to the testimony of Paul, but, as the climax of the historical argument for miracles endeavour to ascertain the exact nature of the evidence upon which belief is claimed for the actual occurrence of those stupendous events. For this our inquiry into the authorship and credibility of the historical books of the New Testament has at length prepared us, and it will be admitted that, in subjecting these asserted miracles to calm and fearless scrutiny—untinged by irreverence or disrespect, if personal earnestness and sincere sympathy with those who believe are any safeguards—the whole theory of Christian miracles will be put to its final test.

CHAPTER II.

THE EVIDENCE OF PAUL

It is better, before proceeding to examine the testimony of Paul for the Resurrection, to clear the way by considering his evidence for miracles in general, apart from that specific instance. In an earlier portion of this work[1] the following remark was made: "Throughout the New Testament, patristic literature, and the records of ecclesiastical miracles, although we have narratives of countless wonderful works performed by others than the writer, and abundant assertion of the possession of miraculous power by the Church, there is no instance that we can remember in which a writer claims to have himself performed a miracle."[2] It is asserted that this statement is erroneous, and that Paul does advance this claim. It may be well to quote the moderate words in which a recent able writer states the case, although not with immediate reference to the particular passage which we have quoted: ".....In these undoubted writings St. Paul certainly shows, by incidental allusions, the good faith of which cannot be questioned, that he believed himself to be endowed with the power of working miracles, and that miracles—or what were thought to be such—were actually wrought both by him and by his contemporaries. He reminds the Corinthians that 'the signs of an Apostle were wrought among them.....in signs and wonders and mighty deeds' (ἐν σημείοις καὶ τέρασι καὶ δυνάμεσι—the usual words for the higher forms of miracle—2 Cor. xii. 12). He tells the Romans that 'he will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by[3] him to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God' (ἐν δυνάμει σημείων

[1] Complete edition, vol. i., p. 200 f.

[2] Dr. Kuenen has made a very similar remark regarding the Old Testament. He says: "When Ezra and Nehemiah relate to us what they themselves did or experienced, there does not appear in their narratives a single departure from the common order of things. On the other hand, these departures are very numerous in the accounts which are separated by a greater or lesser interval from the time to which they refer" (*De Godsdienst van Israël*, 1869, i., p. 22).

[3] These words are printed "in him," but we venture to correct what seems evidently to be a mere misprint, substituting "by" (διά), as in the authorised version, to which Dr. Sanday adheres throughout the whole of these passages, even when it does not represent the actual sense of the original.

καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος Θεοῦ, Rom. xv. 18, 19). He asks the Galatians whether 'he that ministereth to them the Spirit and worketh miracles (ὁ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις) among them doeth it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?' (Gal. iii. 5). In the first Epistle to the Corinthians he goes somewhat elaborately into the exact place in the Christian economy that is to be assigned to the working of miracles and gifts of healing (1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29)."[1]

We shall presently examine these passages, but we must first briefly deal with the question whether, taken in any sense, they furnish an instance "in which a writer claims to have himself performed *a miracle*." It must be obvious to any impartial reader that the remark made in the course of our earlier argument precisely distinguished the general "assertion of the possession of miraculous power by the Church," from the explicit claim to have personally performed "a miracle" in the singular. If, therefore, it were even admitted "that St. Paul treats the fact of his working miracles as a matter of course, *to which a passing reference is sufficient*," such "incidental allusions" would not in the least degree contradict the statement made, but, being the only instances producible, would in fact completely justify it. General and vague references of this kind have by no means the force of a definite claim to have performed some particular miracle. They partake too much of that indiscriminate impression of the possession and common exercise of miraculous powers which characterised the "age of miracles" to have any force. The desired instance, which is not forthcoming, and to which alone reference was made, was a case in which, instead of vague expressions, a writer, stating with precision the particulars, related that he himself had, for instance, actually raised some person from the dead. As we then added, even if Apostles had chronicled their miracles, the argument for their reality would not have been much advanced; but it is a curious phenomenon not undeserving of a moment's attention that Apologists can only refer to such general passages, and cannot quote an instance in which a specific miracle is related in detail by the person who is supposed to have performed it. Passing references on a large scale to the exercise of miraculous power, whilst betraying a suspicious familiarity with phenomena of an exceptional nature, offer too much latitude for inaccuracy and imagination to have the weight of an affirmation in which the mind has been sobered by concentration to details. "Signs and wonders," indefinitely alluded to, may seem much more imposing and astonishing

[1] Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, 1876, p. 11; cf. Westcott, *On the Canon*, 4th ed., 1874, p. 30; Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.*, 1875, p. 854.

than they really are, and it may probably be admitted by everyone that, if we knew the particulars of the occurrences which are thus vaguely indicated, and which may have been considered miraculous in a superstitious age, they might to us possibly appear no miracles at all. General expressions are liable to an exaggeration from which specific allegations are more frequently free. If it be conceded that the Apostle Paul fully believed in the possession by himself and the Church of divine Charismata, the indefinite expression of that belief, in any form, must not be made equivalent to an explicit claim to have performed a certain miracle, the particulars of which are categorically stated.

Passing from this to the more general question, the force of some of these objections will be better understood when we consider the passages in the Epistles which are quoted as expressing Paul's belief in miracles, and endeavour to ascertain his real views: what it is he actually says regarding miracles; and what are the phenomena which are by him considered to be miraculous. We shall not waste time in showing how, partly through the influence of the Septuagint, the words *σημεῖον*, *τέρας*, and *δύναμις* came to be used in a peculiar manner by New Testament writers to indicate miracles. It may, however, be worth while to pause for a moment to ascertain the sense in which Paul, who wrote before there was a "New Testament" at all, usually employed these words. In the four Epistles of Paul the word *σημεῖον* occurs six times. In Rom. iv. 11 Abraham is said to have received the "sign (*σημεῖον*) of circumcision," in which there is nothing miraculous. In 1 Cor. i. 22 it is said: "Since both Jews require signs (*σημεῖα*)[1] and Greeks seek after wisdom"; and again, 1 Cor. xiv. 22: "Wherefore the tongues are for a sign (*σημεῖον*) not to the believing, but to the unbelieving," etc. We shall have more to say regarding these passages presently, but just now we merely quote them to show the use of the word. The only other places in which it occurs[2] are those pointed out, and which are the subject of our discussion. In Rom. xv. 19 the word is used in the plural and combined with *τέρας*: "in the power of signs and wonders" (*σημείων καὶ τεράτων*); and in the second passage (2 Cor. xii. 12) it is employed twice, "the signs (*τὰ σημεῖα*) of the apostle" and the second time again in combination with *τέρας* and *δύναμις*, "both in signs" (*σημείοις*), etc. The word *τέρας* is only twice met with in Paul's writings; that is to say, in Rom. xv. 19 and 2 Cor. xii. 12; and on both occasions, as we

[1] The singular *σημεῖον* of the authorised version must be abandoned before the almost unanimous testimony of all the older MSS.

[2] In the Epistles which bear the name of Paul it is only to be found in 2 Thess. ii. 9, iii. 17.

have just mentioned, it is combined with *σημεῖον*.[1] On the other hand, Paul uses *δύναμις* no less than 34 times,[2] and, leaving for the present out of the question the passages cited, upon every occasion, except one, perhaps, the word has the simple signification of "power." The one exception is Rom. viii. 38, where it occurs in the plural: *δυνάμεις*, "powers," the Apostle expressing his persuasion that nothing will be able to separate us from the love of God, "nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers (*δυνάμεις*), nor height, nor depth," etc. In 1 Cor. xiv. 11, where the authorised version renders the original, "Therefore, if I know not the meaning (*δύναμιν*) of the voice," it has still the same sense.

Before discussing the passages before us we must point out that there is so much doubt, at least, regarding the authenticity of the last two chapters of the Epistle to the Romans that the passage (Rom. xv. 18, 19) can scarcely be presented as evidence on such a point as the reality of miracles. We do not intend to debate the matter closely, but shall merely state a few of the facts of the case and pass on, for it would not materially affect our argument if the passage were altogether beyond suspicion. The Epistle, in our authorised text, ends with a long and somewhat involved doxology (xvi. 25–27); and we may point out here that it had already seemed to be brought to a close not only at the end of chap. xv. (33), but also at xvi. 20. The doxology (xvi. 25–27), which more particularly demands our attention, is stated by Origen[3] to be placed in some MSS. at the end of chapter xiv.; and a similar statement is made by Cyril, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and others. We find these verses actually so placed in L, and in upwards of 220 out of 250 cursive MSS. of Byzantine origin, in an account of ancient MSS. in Cod. 66, in most of the Greek Lectionaries, in the Slavonic and later Syriac versions as also in the Gothic, Arabic (in the polyglot and triglot text), and some MSS. of the Armenian. They are inserted both at the end of xiv. and at the end of the Epistle by the Alexandrian Codex,[4] one of the most

[1] *τέρας* is only met with elsewhere in the New Testament five times: Matt. xxiv. 24, Mark xiii. 22, John iv. 48, 2 Thess. ii. 9, Heb. ii. 4.

[2] Rom. i. 4, 16, 20, viii. 38, ix. 17, xv. 13, xv. 19 (twice), 1 Cor. i. 18, 24, ii. 4, 5, iv. 19, 20, v. 4, vi. 14, xii. 10, 28, 29, xiv. 11, xv. 24, 43, 56. 2 Cor. i. 8, iv. 7, vi. 7, viii. 3 (twice), xii. 9 (twice), 12, xiii. 4 (twice), and Gal. iii. 5.

[3] "*.....In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est, in his quæ non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput* (xvi. 25–27) *diverse positum invenimus. In nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum, quem supra diximus, hoc est 'omne quod non est ex fide peccatum est'* (xiv. 23) *statim cohærens habetur: 'ei autem, qui potens est vos confirmare'* (xvi. 25–27). *Alii vero codices in fine id, ut nunc est positum continent*" (*Comment. ad Rom.*, xvi. 25). This passage is only extant in the Latin version of Rufinus.

[4] xvi. 24 is wholly omitted by the Alexandrian, Vatican, and Sinaitic codices, and also by C and some other MSS.

ancient manuscripts extant, and by some other MSS.[1] Now, how came this doxology to be placed at all at the end of chapter xiv.? The natural inference is that it was so placed because that was the end of the Epistle. Subsequently, chapters xv. and xvi. being added, it is supposed that the closing doxology was removed from the former position and placed at the end of the appended matter. This inference is supported by the important fact that, as we learn from Origen,[2] the last two chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, including the doxology (xvi. 25–27), did not exist in Marcion's text, the most ancient form of it of which we have any knowledge. Tertullian, who makes no reference to these two chapters, speaks of the passage (Rom. xiv. 10) as at the close (in clausula) of the Epistle,[3] and he does not call any attention to their absence from Marcion's Epistle. Is it not reasonable to suppose that they did not form part of his copy? In like manner Irenæus, who very frequently quotes from the rest of the Epistle, nowhere shows acquaintance with these chapters. The first writer who distinctly makes use of any part of them is Clement of Alexandria. It has been argued that Marcion omitted the two chapters because they contain what was opposed to his views, and because they had no dogmatic matter to induce him to retain them; but, whilst the two explanations destroy each other, neither of them is more than a supposition to account for the absence of what, it may with equal propriety be conjectured, never formed part of his text.

The external testimony does not stand alone, but is supported by very strong internal evidence. We shall only indicate one or two points, leaving those who desire to go more deeply into the discussion to refer to works more particularly concerned with it, which we shall sufficiently indicate. It is a very singular thing that Paul, who, when he wrote this Epistle, had never been in Rome, should be intimately acquainted with so many persons

[1] It is unnecessary for us to state that other codices, as B, C, D, E, ℵ, and some cursive MSS., have the verses only at the end of xvi.; nor that they are omitted altogether by F, G, D***, and by MSS. referred to by Jerome.

[2] "*Caput hoc* (xvi. 25 27) *Marcion, a quo Scripturæ evangelicæ atque apostolicæ interpolatæ sunt, de hac epistola penitus abstulit. Et non solum hoc, sed et ab eo loco, ubi scriptum est: Omne autem quod non ex fide, peccatum est* (xiv. 23), *usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit*" (*Comment. ad Rom.*, xvi. 25). We shall not discuss the difference between "*abstulit*" and "*dissecuit*," nor the interpretation given by Nitzsch (*Zeitschr. hist. Theol.*, 1860, p. 285 f.) to the latter word. Most critics agree that Marcion altogether omitted the chapters.

[3] *Adv. Marc.*, v. 14; Rönsch, *Das N. T. Tertullian's*, 1871, p. 349. The passages from Tertullian's writings in which reference is supposed to be made to these chapters which are quoted by Rönsch (p. 350) do not show any acquaintance with them.

there. The fact that there was much intercourse between Rome and other countries by no means accounts for the simultaneous presence there of so many of the Apostle's personal friends. Aquila and Priscilla, who are saluted (xvi. 3), were a short time before (1 Cor. xvi. 19) in Ephesus.[1] It may, moreover, be remarked as a suggestive fact that when, according to the Acts (xxviii. 14 f.), Paul very soon afterwards arrived in Rome, most of these friends seem to have disappeared, and the chief men of the Jews called together by Paul do not seem to be aware of the existence of a Christian body at Rome.[2] Another point is connected with the very passage which has led to this discussion. In Rom. xv. 18, 19, we read: 18. "For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, in order to (εἰς) the obedience of the Gentiles, by word and deed, 19. in the power of signs and wonders (ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων) in the power of the Spirit (ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος); so that from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ," etc. The statement that "from Jerusalem" he had "fully preached" the Gospel is scarcely in agreement with the statement in the Epistle to the Galatians, i. 17–23, ii. 1 f. Moreover, there is no confirmation anywhere that the Apostle preached as far as Illyricum, which was then almost beyond the limits of civilisation. Baur suggests that in making his ministry commence at Jerusalem there is too evident a concession made to the Jewish Christians, according to whom every preacher of the Gospel must naturally commence his career at the holy city. It would detain us much too long to enter upon an analysis of these two chapters, and to show the repetition in them of what has already been said in the earlier part of the Epistle; the singular analogies with the Epistles to the Corinthians, not of the nature of uniformity of style, but of imitation; the peculiarity of the mention of a journey to Spain as the justification of a passing visit to Rome, and perhaps a further apology for even writing a letter to the Church there which another had founded; the suspicious character of the names which are mentioned in the various clauses of salutation; and to state many other still more important objections which various critics have advanced, but which would require more elaborate explanation than can possibly be given here. It will suffice for us to mention that the phenomena presented by the two chapters are so marked and curious that, for a century, they have largely occupied the attention of writers of all shades of opinion, and called forth very elaborate theories to account for them; the apparent necessity for

[1] The writer of 2 Tim. iv. 19 represents them as in Ephesus.
[2] Acts xxviii. 21, 22.

which in itself shows the insecure position of the passage.[1] Semler, without denying the Pauline authorship of the two chapters, considered they did not properly belong to the Epistle to the Romans. He supposed xvi. 3–16 to have been intended merely for the messenger who carried the Epistle, as a list of the persons to whom salutations were to be given, and to these chapter xv. was to be specially delivered. Paulus[2] considered chapter xv. to be a separate letter, addressed specially to the leaders of the Roman Church, chapters i. xiv. being the Epistle to the community in general. The Epistle then being sealed up and ready for any opportunity of transmission, but none presenting itself before his arrival in Corinth, the apostle there, upon an additional sheet, wrote xvi. and entrusted it with the letter to Phœbe. Eichhorn[3] supposed that the parchment upon which the Epistle was written was finished at xiv. 23; and, as Paul and his scribe had only a small sheet at hand, the doxology only, xvi. 25–27, was written upon the one side of it, and on the other the greetings and the apostolic benediction, xvi. 21–24, and thus the letter was completed; but, as it could not immediately be forwarded, the apostle added a fly leaf with chapter xv. Bertholdt,[4] Guericke, and others, adopted similar views more or less modified, representing the close of the Epistle to have been formed by successive postscripts. Renan[5] has affirmed the Epistle to be a circular letter addressed to churches in Rome, Ephesus, and other places, to each of which only certain portions were transmitted with appropriate salutations and endings, which have all been collected into the one Epistle in the form in which we have it. David Schulz conjectured that xvi. 1–20 was an Epistle written from Rome to the church at Ephesus; and this theory was substantially adopted by Ewald who held that xvi. 3–20 was part of a lost Epistle to Ephesus—and by many other critics.[7] Of course the virtual authenticity of the xv. xvi. chapters, nearly or exactly as they are, is affirmed by many writers. Baur, however, after careful investigation, pronounced the two chapters inauthentic, and in this he is followed by able critics.[8] Under all these circumstances it is obvious that we need not occupy

[1] *Diss. de duplici apend. ep. P. ad Rom.* 1767 · *Paraphr. epist. ad Rom.*, 1769, p. 290 f. [2] *Uebers. u. Erkl. des Römer. u. Galaterbr.*, 1831, *Einl.*

[3] *Einl.*, iii. 232 f. [4] *Einl.*, viii., p. 3303 f.

[5] *Gesammtgesch. N. T.*, p. 327 f. [6] *St. Paul*, 1869, p. lxiii f.

[7] Schulz, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1829, p. 609 f.; Ewald, *Sendschr. d. Paulus*, p. 345, anm., p. 428 f.; Laurent, *N. T. Stud.*, 1866, p. 32 f.; Mangold, *Römerbr.*, 1866, p. 38, 62; Ritschl, *Jahrb. deutsche Th.*, 1856, p. 352; Reuss, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 98; Schott, *Isagoge*, p. 249 f.; Weisse, *Philos. Dogmatik*, 1855, i., p. 146.

[8] Baur, *Tüb. Zeitschr.*, 1836, iii., p. 97 f.; *Paulus*, i., p. 393 f.; Lucht, *Ueb. die beid. letzt. Cap. des Römerbr.*, 1871; Scholten, *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1876, p. 3 f.; Schwegler, *Das nachap. Z.*, i., p. 299; ii. 123 f.; Volkmar, *Römerbr.*,

ourselves much with the passage in Rom. xv. 18, 19, but our argument will equally apply to it. In order to complete this view of the materials, we may simply mention, as we pass on, that the authenticity of 2 Cor. xii. 12 has likewise been impugned by a few critics, and the verse, or at least the words *σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν καὶ δυνάμεσιν*, as well as Rom. xv. 19, declared an interpolation. This cannot, however, so far as existing evidence goes, be demonstrated; and, beyond the mere record of the fact, this conjecture does not here require further notice.

It may be well, before proceeding to the Epistles to the Corinthians, which furnish the real matter for discussion, first to deal with the passage cited from Gal. iii. 5, which is as follows: "He then that supplieth to you the Spirit and worketh powers (*δυνάμεις*) within you (*ἐν ὑμῖν*), (doeth he it) from works of law or from hearing of faith?"[1] The authorised version reads, "and worketh miracles among you": but this cannot be maintained, and *ἐν ὑμῖν* must be rendered "within you," the *ἐν* certainly retaining its natural signification when used with *ἐνεργεῖν*, the primary meaning of which is itself to in work. The vast majority of critics of all schools agree in this view.[2] There is an evident reference to iii. 2, and to the reception of the Spirit, here further characterised as producing such effects within the minds of those who receive it,[3] the worker who gives the Spirit being God. The opinion most commonly held is that reference is here made to the "gifts" (*χαρίσματα*), regarding which the Apostle elsewhere speaks,[4] and

1875, p. 15 f., 129 f.; cf. Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1874, p. 511 f.; Lipsius, *Protestanten-Bibel*, 1872, p. 488, 612, 629; Rovers, *Hecft Paulus sich op woml. bevoep.*, 1870, p. 15 f.; Zeller, *Apg.*, p. 488. Some consider ch. xvi. alone inauthentic, as Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii., p. 137; Weiss, *Das Marcusevang.*, 1872, p. 495, anm. 1.

[1] *ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως*: Gal. iii. 5.

[2] So Alford, Bisping, Ellicott, Ewald, Grotius, Hoffmann, Holtzmann, Lightfoot, Matthies, Meyer, Olshausen, Schott, Schrader, Usteri, De Wette, Wieseler, Wordsworth, etc., in 1.

[3] Olshausen, for instance, says: "*Das ἐν ὑμῖν ist nicht zu fassen: unter euch, sondern = ἐν καρδίαις ὑμῶν, in dem die Geisteswirkung als eine innerliche gedacht ist*" (*Bibl. Comm.*, iv., p. 58).

[4] Dr. Lightfoot says on the words "*ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν* (Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 10), *ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων* (with vv. 28, 29), Matt. xiv. 2, *αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ* (comp. Mark vi. 14). These passages favour the sense 'worketh miraculous powers *in* you,' rather than 'worketh miracles *among* you'; and this meaning also accords better with the context: (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 6), *ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν*. What was the exact nature of these 'powers,' whether they were exerted over the physical or the moral world, it is impossible to determine. The limitations implied in 1 Cor. xii. 10, and the general use of *δυνάμεις*, point rather to the former. It is important to notice how here, as in the Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul assumes the possession of these extraordinary powers by his converts

which we shall presently discuss; but this is by no means certain, and cannot be determined. It is equally probable that he may refer to the spiritual effect produced upon the souls of the Galatians by the Gospel which he so frequently represents as a "power" of God. In any case, it is clear that there is no external miracle referred to, and even if allusion to Charismata be understood we have yet to ascertain precisely what these were. We shall endeavour to discover whether there was anything in the least degree miraculous in these "gifts," but there is no affirmation in this passage which demands special attention, and whatever general significance it may have will be met when considering the others which are indicated.

The first passage in the Epistles to the Corinthians, which is pointed out as containing the testimony of Paul both to the reality of miracles in general and to the fact that he himself performed them, is the following (2 Cor. xii. 12): "Truly the signs (*σημεῖα*) of the Apostle were wrought in you (*κατειργάσθη ἐν ὑμῖν*) in all patience, both in signs and wonders and powers (*ἐν σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν καὶ δυνάμεσιν*)."[1] We have to justify two departures in this rendering from that generally received. The first of these is the adoption of "wrought in you," instead of "wrought among you"; and the second, the simple use of "powers" for *δυνάμεις*, instead of "mighty works." We shall take the second first. We have referred to every passage except 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29, in which Paul makes use of the word *δυνάμεις*, and, fortunately, they are sufficiently numerous to afford us a good insight into his practice. It need not be said that the natural sense of *δυνάμεις* is in no case "mighty works" or miracles, and that such an application of the Greek word is peculiar to the New Testament and, subsequently, to Patristic literature. There is, however, no ground for attributing this use of the word to Paul. It is not so used in the *Septuagint*, and it is quite evident that the Apostle does not employ it to express external effects or works, but spiritual phenomena or potentiality. In the passage (Gal. iii. 5) which we have just discussed, where the word occurs in the plural, as here, it is understood to express "powers." We may quote the rendering of that passage by the Bishop of Gloucester: "He then, *I say*, that ministereth to you the Spirit and worketh *mighty* powers within you, *doeth he it* by the works of the law or by the report of faith?"[2] Why "mighty"

as an acknowledged fact" (*Ep. to the Gal.*, p. 135); cf. Wordsworth, *Gk. Test., St. Paul's Epistles*, p. 57, and especially p. 128, where, on 1 Cor. xii. 11, Dr. Wordsworth notes: "*ἐνεργεῖ*] *in-worketh*," and quotes Cyril, ".....and the Holy Spirit *works in* every member of Christ's body," etc.

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 12.

[2] Ellicott, *St. Paul's Ep. to the Galatians*, 4th ed., 1867, p. 154 f.

should be inserted it is difficult to understand; but the word is rightly printed in italics to show that it is not actually expressed in the Greek. "What was the exact nature of these 'powers'..... it is impossible to determine," observes another scholar quoted above,[1] on the same passage.[2] In 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29, where the plural δυνάμεις again occurs, the intention to express "powers"[3] and not external results—miracles—is perfectly clear, the word being in the last two verses used alone to represent the "gifts." In all of these passages the word is the representative of the "powers" and not of the "effects."[4] This interpretation is rendered more clear by, and at the same time confirms, the preceding phrase, "were wrought in you" (κατειργάσθη ἐν ὑμῖν). "Powers" (δυνάμεις), as in Gal. iii. 5, are worked "within you," and, the rendering of that passage being so settled, it becomes authoritative for this. If direct confirmation of Paul's meaning be required, we have it in Rom. vii. 8, where we find the same verb used with ἐν in this sense: "But sin.....wrought in me (κατειργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ) all manner of coveting," etc.; and with this may also be compared 2 Cor. vii. 11....."what earnestness it wrought in you" (κατειργάσατο ἐν[5] ὑμῖν). It was thus Paul's habit to speak of spiritual effects wrought "within," and, as he referred to the "powers" (δυνάμεις) worked "within" the souls of the Galatians, so he speaks of them here as "wrought in" the Corinthians. It will become clear as we proceed that the addition to δυνάμεις of "signs and wonders" does not in the least affect this interpretation. In 1 Cor. xiv. 22 the Apostle speaks of the gift of "tongues" as "a sign" (σημεῖον).

Upon the supposition that Paul was affirming the actual performance of miracles by himself, how extraordinary becomes the statement that they "were wrought in all patience," for it is manifest that "in all patience" (ἐν πάσῃ ὑπομονῇ) does not form part of the signs, as some have argued, but must be joined to the verb (κατειργάσθη).[6] It may be instructive to quote a few words of Olshausen upon the point: "The ἐν πάσῃ ὑπομονῇ is not altogether easy. It certainly cannot be doubtful that it is to be joined to κατειργάσθη, and not to what follows; but for what reason does Paul here make it directly

[1] Dr. Lightfoot, see note 2, p. 337.

[2] It is rendered "vertues" in Wyclif's version.

[3] "δυνάμεις] *powers*. From *persons* he passes to *things*," etc. Wordsworth, on 1 Cor. xii. 28, *Gk. Test., St. Paul's Epistles*, p. 129.

[4] Grotius renders δυνάμεσιν = virtutibus ad 2 Cor. xii. 12 (*Annot. in N. T.*, vi. 539).

[5] ἐν is found in C, F, G, and other MSS., although it is omitted in the other great codices; this, however, does not affect the argument.

[6] So Alford, Billroth, Ewald, Maier, Meyer, Neander, Olshausen, Osiander, de Wette, etc., l. c.

prominent that he wrought his signs in all patience? It seems to me probable that in this there may be a reproof to the Corinthians, who, in spite of such signs, still showed themselves wavering regarding the authority of the Apostle. In such a position, Paul would say, he had, patiently waiting, allowed his light to shine amongst them, certain of ultimate triumph."[1] This will hardly be accepted by anyone as a satisfactory solution of the difficulty, which is a real one if it be assumed that Paul, claiming to have performed miracles, wrought them "in all patience." Besides, the matter is complicated, and the claim to have himself performed a miracle still more completely vanishes, when we consider the fact that the passive construction of the sentence does not actually represent Paul as the active agent by whom the signs were wrought. "Truly the signs of the apostle were wrought," but how wrought? Clearly he means by the Spirit, as he distinctly states to the Galatians. To them "Jesus Christ (the Messiah) was fully set forth crucified," and he asks them: Was it from works of the law, or from hearing in faith the Gospel thus preached to them, that they "received the Spirit"? and that he who supplies the Spirit "and worketh powers" in them does so? From faith, of course.[2] The meaning of Paul, therefore, was this: His Gospel was preached among them "in all patience," which being received by the hearing of faith, the Spirit was given to them, and the signs of the apostle were thus wrought among them. The representation is made throughout the Acts that the apostles lay their hands on those who believe, and they receive the Holy Spirit and speak with tongues. If any special "sign of the apostle" can be indicated at all, it is this; and in illustration we may point to one statement made in the Acts. Philip, the evangelist, who was not an apostle, is represented as going into Samaria and preaching the Messiah to the Samaritans, who give heed to the things spoken by him, and multitudes are baptised (viii. 5, 6, 12), but there was not the outpouring of the Holy Spirit which usually accompanied the apostolic baptism. "And the Apostles in Jerusalem, having heard that Samaria had received the word of God, sent unto them Peter and John; who when they came down prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit—for as yet he had fallen upon none of them, but they had only been baptised into the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they (the Apostles) their hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit."[3] We may further refer to the episode at Ephesus (Acts xix. 1 f.) where Paul finds certain disciples who, having only been baptised into John's baptism, had not received the Holy Spirit,

[1] Olshausen, *Bibl. Com.*, iii., p. 879 f.
[2] Gal. iii. 1 f.
[3] Acts viii. 14–17.

nor even heard whether there was a Holy Spirit. (xix. 6.) "And Paul having laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them, and they were speaking with tongues and prophesying."

When we examine Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, we find ample assurance that the interpretation here given of this passage is correct, and that he does not refer, as Apologists have maintained, to miracles wrought by himself, but to the Charismata, which were supposed to have been bestowed upon the Corinthians who believed, and which thus were the signs of his apostleship. The very next verse to that which is before us shows this: "Truly the signs of the Apostle were wrought in you in all patience..... 13. For (γάρ) what is there wherein ye were inferior to the other Churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you?" The mere performance of signs and wonders did not constitute their equality; but in the possession of the Charismata—regarding which so much is said in the first epistle, and which were the result of his preaching—they were not inferior to the other Churches, and only inferior, Paul says with his fine irony, in not having, like the other Churches with their apostles, been called upon to acquire the merit of bearing his charges. What could be more distinct than the Apostle's opening address in the first Epistle: "I thank my God always, on your behalf, for the grace of God which was given you in Christ Jesus; that in everything ye were enriched by him (at the time of their conversion[1]), in all utterance and in all knowledge—even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you—*so that ye come behind in no gift* (χαρίσματι)," etc.? For this reason they were not inferior to the other Churches, and those were the signs of the Apostle which were wrought in them. Paul very distinctly declares the nature of his ministry amongst the Corinthians and the absence of other "signs": 1 Cor. i. 22 f. "Since both Jews demand signs (σημεῖα) and Greeks seek after wisdom, but *we* (ἡμεῖς δὲ) preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling-block and unto Gentiles foolishness, but unto those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power (δύναμιν) of God and the wisdom of God." The contrast is here clearly drawn between the requirement of Jews (signs) and of Greeks (wisdom) and Paul's actual ministry; no signs, but a scandal (σκάνδαλον) to the Jew, and no wisdom, but foolishness to the Greek, but this word of the cross (λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ) "to us who are being saved is the power (δύναμις) of God" (i. 18).[2] The Apostle tells us what he considers the "sign of the Apostle," when, more directly defending himself against the opponents who evidently denied his Apostolic claims, he says vehemently: 1 Cor. ix. 1 f. "Am I not free? Am

[1] Stanley, *Eps. to the Cor.*, p. 23.

[2] And again Rom. i. 16, etc.

I not an Apostle? have I not seen Jesus our Lord? *are not ye my work in the Lord?* If I be not an Apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you: *for the seal* (σφραγίς) *of my Apostleship are ye in the Lord.*"[1] It cannot, we think, be doubted, when the passage (2 Cor. xii. 12) is attentively considered, that Paul does not refer to external miracles performed by him, but to the Charismata which he supposed to be conferred upon the Corinthian Christians on their acceptance of the Gospel which the Apostle preached. These Charismata, however, are advanced as miraculous, and the passages (1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29) are quoted in support of the statement we are discussing, and these now demand our attention.

It may be well at once to give the verses which are referred to, and in which it is said that Paul "goes somewhat elaborately into the exact place in the Christian economy that is to be assigned to the working of miracles and gifts of healing" (1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29). It is necessary for the full comprehension of the case that we should quote the context: xii. 4. "Now there are diversities of gifts (χαρισμάτων), but the same Spirit; 5. and there are diversities of ministries (διακονιῶν), and the same Lord; 6. and there are diversities of workings (ἐνεργημάτων), but it is the same God who worketh the all in all (ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν): 7. But to each is given the manifestation of the Spirit (φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος) for profit; 8. For to one is given by the Spirit a word of wisdom (λόγος σοφίας); to another a word of knowledge (λόγος γνώσεως) according to the same Spirit; 9. to another faith (πίστις) in the same Spirit, to another gifts of healings (χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων) in the one Spirit; 10. to another (inward) workings of powers (ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων); to another prophecy (προφητεία); to another discerning of spirits (διάκρισις πνευμάτων); to another kinds of tongues (γένη γλωσσῶν); to another interpretation of tongues (ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν); 11. but all these worketh (ἐνεργεῖ) the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each severally as he wills." After illustrating this by showing the mutual dependence of the different members and senses of the body, the Apostle proceeds: v. 28. "And God set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, after that powers (δυνάμεις), after that gifts of healings (χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων), helpings (ἀντιλήμψεις), governings (κυβερνήσεις), kinds of tongues (γένη γλωσσῶν). 29. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all powers (δυνάμεις)? 30. have all gifts of healings (χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων)? do all speak with tongues (γλώσσαις λαλοῦσιν)? do all interpret (διερμηνεύουσιν)?"

[1] Comp. Rom. iv. 11, "and he (Abraham) received a sign (σημεῖον) of circumcision, a seal (σφραγῖδα) of the righteousness of the faith," etc.

Before we commence an examination of this interesting and important passage, it is essential that we should endeavour to disabuse our minds of preconceived ideas. Commentators are too prone to apply to the Apostle's remarks a system of interpretation based upon statements made by later and less-informed writers, and warped by belief in the reality of a miraculous element pervading all apostolic times, which have been derived mainly from post-apostolic narratives. What do we really know of the phenomena supposed to have characterised the Apostolic age, and which were later, and are now, described as miraculous? With the exception of what we glean from the writings of Paul, we know absolutely nothing from any contemporary writer and eye-witness. In the Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles we have detailed accounts of many miracles said to have been performed by the Apostles and others; but these narratives were all written at a much later period, and by persons who are unknown, and most of whom are not even affirmed to have been eye-witnesses.[1] In the Acts of the Apostles we have an account of some of the very Charismata referred to by Paul in the passage above quoted, and we shall thus have the advantage of presently comparing the two accounts. We must, however, altogether resist any attempt to insert between the lines of the Apostle's writing ideas and explanations derived from the author of the Acts and from patristic literature, and endeavour to understand what it is he himself says and intends to say. It must not be supposed that we in the slightest degree question the fact that the Apostle Paul believed in the reality of supernatural intervention in mundane affairs, or that he asserted the actual occurrence of certain miracles. Our desire is as far as possible to ascertain what Paul himself has to say upon specific phenomena, now generally explained as miraculous, and thus, descending from vague generalities to more distinct statements, to ascertain the value of his opinion regarding the character of such phenomena. It cannot fail to be instructive to determine something of the nature of Charismata from an eye-witness who believed them to have been supernatural. His account, as we have seen, is the most precious evidence of the Church to the reality of the miraculous.

The first point which must be observed in connection with the Charismata referred to by Paul in the passage before us is that, whilst there are diversities amongst them, all the phenomena described are ascribed to "one and the same Spirit dividing to each severally as he wills"; and, consequently, that, although there may be differences in their form and value, a supernatural origin

[1] It is suggestive that the curious passage, Mark xvi. 17–18, is not even by the author of the second Gospel, but a later addition.

is equally assigned to all the "gifts" enumerated. What, then, are these Charismata? "A word of wisdom," "a word of knowledge," and "faith" are the first three mentioned. What the precise difference was, in Paul's meaning, between the utterance of wisdom (*σοφία*) and of knowledge (*γνῶσις*) it is impossible now with certainty to say, nor is it very essential for us to inquire. The two words are combined in Rom. xi. 33: "O the depths of the riches and wisdom (*σοφίας*) and knowledge (*γνώσεως*) of God!" and in this very Epistle some varying use is made of both words. Paul tells the Corinthians (1, i. 17) that Christ did not send him "in wisdom of word" (*οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου*) or utterance: and (ii. 1) "not with excellency of word or wisdom" (*λόγου ἢ σοφίας*, cf. ii. 4); and further on he says (i. 30) that Christ Jesus "was made unto us wisdom (*σοφία*) from God." The most suggestive expressions[1] are the following, we think: 1 Cor. ii. 6. "But we speak wisdom (*σοφίαν*) among the perfect, yet not the wisdom (*σοφίαν*) of this age, nor of the rulers of this age, that come to nought, 7. but we speak God's wisdom (*θεοῦ σοφίαν*) in mystery, the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the ages unto our glory 8. which none of the rulers of this age has known, for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory. 9. But as it is written, 'What eye saw not,' etc. 10. But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit..... 11. .....even so also the things of God knoweth no one but the Spirit of God. 12. But we received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is from God, that we might know the things that are freely given us by God; 13. which things also we speak, not in words taught by human wisdom, but in words taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual things to the spiritual"[2] (*πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες*).

It is quite clear from all the antecedent context that Paul's preaching was specially the Messiah crucified, "Christ the power of God and the wisdom (*σοφίαν*) of God," and we may conclude reasonably that the *λόγος σοφίας* of our passage was simply the eloquent utterance of this doctrine. In like manner, we may get some insight into the meaning which Paul attached to the word "knowledge" (*γνῶσις*). It will be remembered that at the very opening of the first Epistle to the Corinthians Paul expresses his thankfulness that in everything they were enriched in Christ Jesus: i. 5. "in all utterance (*λόγῳ*) and in all knowledge (*γνώσει*), 6. even as the testimony of the Christ was confirmed in you"; that is to say, according to commentators, by these very Charismata. Later,

[1] The word is used in the following passages of Paul's four Epistles: Rom. xi. 33; 1 Cor. i. 17, 19, 20, 21 (twice), 22, 24, 30, ii. 1, 4, 5, 6 (twice), 7, 13, iii. 19, xii. 8; 2 Cor. i. 12.

[2] There is considerable room for doubt as to the real sense of this last phrase.

speaking of "tongues," he says (1 Cor. xiv. 6): "……What shall I profit you, except I shall speak to you either in revelation or in knowledge (ἐν γνώσει), or in prophecy, or in teaching?" We obtain a clearer insight into his meaning in the second Epistle, in the passage 2 Cor. ii. 14–16, and still more in iv. 3–6 and x. 5, where he describes metaphorically his weapons as not carnal, but strong through God, "casting down reasonings and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of the Christ"; and if we ventured to offer an opinion, it would be that Paul means by λόγος γνώσεως simply Christian theology. We merely offer this as a passing suggestion. Little need be said with regard to the gift of "faith" (πίστις), which is perfectly intelligible.

Apologists argue that by these three "gifts" some supernatural form of wisdom, knowledge, and faith is expressed, and we shall have something more to say on the point presently; but here we only point out that there is no ground for such an assertion except the fact that the Apostle ascribes to them a supernatural origin, or, in fact, believes in the inspiration of such qualities. All that can be maintained is that Paul accounts for the possession of characteristics which we now know to be natural by asserting that they are the direct gift of the Holy Spirit. There is not the faintest evidence to show that these natural capabilities did not antecedently exist in the Corinthians, and were not merely stimulated into action in Christian channels by the religious enthusiasm and zeal accompanying their conversion; but, on the contrary, every reason to believe this to be the case, as we shall further see.[1] In fact, according to the Apostolic Church, every quality was a supernatural gift, and all ability or excellence in practical life directly emanated from the action of the Holy Spirit.

We may now proceed to "gifts of healings" (χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων),[2] which it will be noted are doubly in the plural, indicating, as is supposed, a variety of special gifts, each having reference probably to special diseases. What is there to show that there was anything more miraculous in "gifts of healings" than in the possession of an utterance of wisdom, an utterance of knowledge, or faith? Nothing whatever. On the contrary, everything, from the unvarying experience of the world, to the inferences which we shall be able to draw from the whole of this information

[1] We may here say that attempts have been made to show that the Apostle classifies the Charismata in groups of threes, and even sets forth the three persons of the Trinity as the several donors. It would be useless for us to touch upon the point.

[2] The word ἴαμα only occurs in the N. T. in 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29. It might better be rendered "means of healing," or "remedies."

regarding the Charismata, shows that there was no miraculous power of healing either possessed or exercised. Reference is frequently made to the passage in the so-called Epistle of James as an illustration of this, v. 14: "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, having anointed him with oil in the name of the Lord: 15. And the prayer of faith shall save the afflicted, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him." The context, however, not only shows that in this there is no allusion to any gift of healing or miraculous power, but seems to ignore the existence of any such gift. The Epistle continues: v. 16. "Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray for one another that ye may be healed. The supplication of a righteous man availeth much when it is working." And then the successful instance of the prayer of Elijah, that it might not rain, and again that it might rain, is given. The passage is merely an assertion of the efficacy of prayer, and if, as is not unfrequently done, it be argued that the gifts of healing were probably applied by means of earnest prayer for the sick, it may be said that this is the only "gift" which is supposed to have descended to our times. It does not require much argument to show that the reality of a miraculous gift cannot be demonstrated by appealing to the objective efficacy of prayer. We may, in passing, refer Apologists who hold the authenticity of the Epistles to the Philippians and to Timothy to indications which do not quite confirm the supposition that a power of miraculous healing actually existed in the Apostolic Church. In the Epistle to the Philippians, ii. 25 f., Paul is represented as sending Epaphroditus to them (v. 26), "Since he was longing after you all and was distressed because ye heard that he was sick. (27) For, indeed, he was sick nigh unto death; but God had mercy on him; and not on him only, but on me also, that I might not have sorrow upon sorrow. I sent him, therefore, the more anxiously, that, when ye see him, ye may rejoice again, and that I may be the less sorrowful." The anxiety felt by the Philippians, and the whole language of the writer, in this passage, are rather inconsistent with the knowledge that miraculous power of healing was possessed by the Church, and of course by Paul, which would naturally have been exerted for one in whom so many were keenly interested. Then, in 2 Tim. iv. 20, the writer says, "Trophimus I left at Miletus sick." If miraculous powers of healing existed, why were they not exerted in this case? If they were exerted and failed for special reasons, why are these not mentioned? It is unfortunate that there is so little evidence of the application of these gifts. On the other hand, we may suggest that medical art scarcely existed at that period in such communities, and that the remedies practised

admirably lent themselves to the theory of "gifts" of healings, rather than to any recognition of the fact that the accurate diagnosis of disease and successful treatment of it can only be the result of special study and experience.

The next gift mentioned is (v. 10) "workings of powers" (*ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων*), very unwarrantably rendered in our "authorised" version "the working of miracles." We have already said enough regarding Paul's use of *δύναμις*. The phrase before us would be even better rendered in- or inward-workings of powers,[1] and the use made of *ἐνεργεῖν* by Paul throughout his Epistles would confirm this. It may be pointed out that, as the gifts just referred to are for "healings," it is difficult to imagine any class of "miracles" which could well be classed under a separate head as the special "working of miracles" contemplated by Apologists. Infinitely the greater number of miracles related in the Gospels and Acts are "healings" of disease. Is it possible to suppose that Paul really indicated by this expression a distinct order of "miracles" properly so-called? Certainly not. Neither the words themselves used by Paul, properly understood, nor the context, permit us to suppose that he referred to the working of miracles at all. We have no intention of conjecturing what these "powers" were supposed to be; it is sufficient that we show they cannot rightly be exaggerated into an assertion of the power of working miracles. It is much more probable that, in the expression, no external working by the gifted person is implied at all, and that the gift referred to "in-workings of powers" within his own mind, producing the ecstatic state, with its usual manifestations, or those visions and supposed revelations to which Paul himself was subject. Demoniacs, or persons supposed to be possessed of evil spirits, were called *ἐνεργούμενοι*, and it is easy to conceive how anyone under strong religious impressions, at that epoch of most intense religious emotion, might, when convulsed by nervous or mental excitement, be supposed the subject of inward workings of powers supernaturally imparted. Every period of religious zeal has been marked by such phenomena.[2] These conclusions are further corroborated by the next gifts enumerated. The first of these is "prophecy" (*προφητεία*), by which is not intended the mere foretelling of events, but speaking "unto men

[1] Dr. Wordsworth has on 1 Cor. xii. 6, "*ἐνεργημάτων*] *in-wrought works*. *Ἐνέργημα* is more than *ἔργον*. For *ἐνέργημα* is not every work, it is an *in-wrought* work," etc. On v. 11: "*ἐνεργεῖ*] *in-worketh*"; and on v. 28: "*δυνάμεις powers*" (*Greek Test. St. Paul's Eps.*, p. 127 f.).

[2] We may point out further instances of the use of *ἐνεργεῖν ἐν* in the New Testament, in addition to those already referred to, and which should be examined:—Ephes. i. 20, ii. 2, iii. 20; Phil. ii. 13; Col. i. 29; 1 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 7.

edification and exhortation and comfort," as the Apostle himself says (xiv. 3); and an illustration of this may be pointed out in Acts iv. 36, where the name Barnabas—"Son of prophecy," being interpreted is said to be "Son of Exhortation" (*υἱὸς παρακλήσεως*). To this follows the "discerning (or judging) of spirits" (*διάκρισις πνευμάτων*), a gift which, if we are to judge by Paul's expressions elsewhere, was simply the exercise of natural intelligence and discernment. In an earlier part of the first Epistle, rebuking the Corinthians for carrying their disputes before legal tribunals, he says: vi. 5, "Is it so that there is not even one wise man among you who shall be able to discern (*διακρῖναι*) between his brethren?" Again, in xi. 31, "But if we discerned (*διεκρίνομεν*) we should not be judged (*ἐκρινώμεθα*)" (cf. v. 28, 29), and in xiv. 29, "Let Prophets speak two or three, and let the others discern" (*διακρινέτωσαν*).

We reserve the "kinds of tongues" and "interpretation of tongues" for separate treatment, and proceed to verses 28 f., in which, after illustrating his meaning by the analogy of the body, the Apostle resumes his observations upon the Charismata, and it is instructive to consider the rank he ascribes to the various gifts. He classes them: "First Apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, after that powers, after that gifts of healings, helpings, governings, kinds of tongues." These so-called miraculous gifts are here placed in a lower class than those of exhortation and teaching, which is suggestive; for it is difficult to suppose that even a man like Paul could have regarded the possession of such palpable and stupendous power as the instantaneous and miraculous healing of disease, or the performance of other miracles, below the gift of teaching or exhortation. It is perfectly intelligible that the practice of medicine as it was then understood, and the skill which might have been attained in particular branches of disease by individuals, not to speak of those who may have been supposed to be performing miracles when they dealt with cases of hysteria or mental excitement, might appear to the Apostle much inferior to a gift for imparting spiritual instruction and admonition; but the actual possession of supernatural power, the actual exercise of what was believed to be the personal attribute of God, must have been considered a distinction more awful and elevated than any gift of teaching. It will be noticed also that other Charismata are here introduced, whilst "discerning of spirits" is omitted. The new gifts, "helpings" and "governings," have as little a miraculous character about them as any that have preceded them. Is it not obvious that all special ability, all official capacity, is simply represented as a divine gift, and regarded as a "manifestation of the Spirit"?

It is important in the highest degree to remember that the

supposed miraculous Charismata are not merely conferred upon a few persons, but are bestowed upon all the members of the Apostolic Church.[1] "The extraordinary Charismata which the Apostles conferred through their imposition of hands," writes Dr. von Döllinger, "were so diffused and distributed that nearly every one, or at any rate many, temporarily at least, had a share in one gift or another. This was a solitary case in history, which has never since repeated itself, and which, in default of experience, we can only approximately picture to ourselves. One might say: the metal of the Church was still glowing, molten, formless, and presented altogether another aspect than, since then, in the condition of the cold and hardened casting."[2] The apologetic representation of the case is certainly unique in history, and, therefore, in its departure from all experience might well have excited suspicion. Difficult as it is to picture such a state, it is worth while to endeavour to do so to a small extent. Let us imagine communities of Christians, often of considerable importance, in all the larger cities as well as in smaller towns, all or most of the members of which were endowed with supernatural gifts, and, amongst others, with power to heal diseases and to perform miracles; all the intellectual and religious qualities requisite for the guidance, edification, and government of the communities supplied abundantly and specially by the Holy Spirit; the ordinary dependence of society on the natural capacity and power of its leaders dispensed with, and every possible branch of moral culture and physical comfort provided with inspired and miraculously-gifted ministries; the utterance of wisdom and knowledge, exhortation and teaching, workings of healings, discernment of spirits, helpings, governings, kinds of tongues supernaturally diffused throughout the community by God himself. As a general rule, communities have to do as well as they can

[1] Cf. Eph. iv. 7, 11; 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11. Dean Stanley says: "It is important to observe that these multiplied allusions imply a state of things in the Apostolic age which has certainly not been seen since. On particular occasions, indeed, both in the first four centuries, and afterwards in the Middle Ages, miracles are ascribed by contemporary writers to the influence of the relics of particular individuals; but there has been no occasion when they have been so emphatically ascribed to whole societies, so closely mixed up with the ordinary course of life. It is not maintained that every member of the Corinthian Church had all, or the greater part, of these gifts; but it certainly appears that everyone had some gift; and, this being the case, we are enabled to realise the total difference of the organisation of the Apostolic Church from any through which it has passed in its later stages. It was still in a state of fusion. Every part of the new society was instinct with a life of its own. The whole atmosphere which it breathed must have confirmed the belief in the importance and novelty of the crisis" (*The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, 4th ed., p. 224).

[2] *Christenthum und Kirche, 2te aufl.*, 1868, p. 298.

without such help, and eloquent instructors and able administrators do not generally fail them. The question, therefore, intrudes itself: Why were ordinary and natural means so completely set aside, and the qualifications which are generally found adequate for the conduct and regulation of life supplanted by divine Charismata? At least, we may suppose that communities endowed with such supernatural advantages, and guided by the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit, must have been distinguished in every way from the rest of humanity, and must have presented a spectacle of the noblest life, free from the weakness and inconsistency of the world, and betraying none of the moral and intellectual frailties of ordinary society. At the very least, and without exaggeration, communities in every member of which there existed some supernatural manifestation of the Holy Spirit might be expected to show very marked superiority and nobility of character.

When we examine the Epistles of Paul and other ancient documents, we find anything but supernatural qualities in the Churches supposed to be endowed with such miraculous gifts. On the contrary, it is scarcely possible to exaggerate the intensely human character of the conduct of such communities: their fickleness; the weakness of their fidelity to the Gospel of Paul; their wavering faith, and the ease and rapidity with which they are led astray; their petty strifes and discords; their party spirit; their almost indecent abuse of some of their supposed gifts, such as "tongues," for which Paul rebukes them so severely. The very Epistles, in fact, in which we read of the supernatural endowments and organisation of the Church are full of evidence that there was nothing supernatural in them. The primary cause, apparently, for which the first letter was written to the Corinthians was the occurrence of divisions and contentions amongst them (i. 10 f.), parties of Paul, of Apollos, of Cephas, of Christ, which make the Apostle give thanks (i. 14) that he had baptised but few of them, that no one might say that they were baptised into his name. Paul had not been able to speak to them as spiritual, but as carnal, mere babes in Christ (iii. 1 f.); he fed them with milk, not meat, for they were not yet able, "nor even now are ye able," he says, "for ye are yet carnal. For whereas there is among you envying and strife; are ye not carnal?" He continues in the same strain throughout the letter, admonishing them in no flattering terms. Speaking of his sending Timothy to them, he says (iv. 18 f.): "But some of you were puffed up, as though I were not coming to you; but I will come to you shortly, if it be the Lord's will, and will know, not the speech of them who are puffed up, but the power." There is serious sin amongst them, which they show no readiness to purge away. Moreover, these

Corinthians have lawsuits with each other (vi. 1 f.), and, instead of taking advantage of those supernatural Charismata, they actually take their causes for decision before the uninspired tribunals of the heathen rather than submit them to the judgment of the saints. Their own members, who have gifts of wisdom and of knowledge, discerning of spirits and governings, have apparently so little light to throw upon the regulation of social life that the Apostle has to enter into minute details for their admonition and guidance. He has even to lay down rules regarding the head-dresses of women in the Churches (xi. 3 f.). Even in their very church assemblies there are divisions of a serious character amongst them (xi. 18 f.). They misconduct themselves in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, for they make it, as it were, their own supper, "and one is hungry and another is drunken." "What!" he indignantly exclaims, "have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the Church of God?" To the Galatians Paul writes, marvelling that they are so soon removing from him that called them in the grace of Christ unto a different Gospel (i. 6). "O foolish Galatians," he says (iii. 1), "who bewitched you?" In that community, also, opposition to Paul and denial of his authority had become powerful.

If we turn to other ancient documents, the Epistles to the seven Churches do not present us with a picture of supernatural perfection in those communities, though doubtless, like the rest, they had received these gifts. The other Epistles of the New Testament depict a state of things which by no means denotes any extraordinary or abnormal condition of the members. We may quote a short passage to show that we do not strain this representation unduly. "But, certainly," says Dr. von Döllinger, "in spite of a rich outpouring of spiritual gifts vouchsafed to it, a community could fall into wanton error. Paul had in Corinth, contemporaneously with his description of the Charismatic state of the Church there, to denounce sad abuses. In the Galatian community Judaistic seduction, and the darkening of Christian doctrine through the delusion as to the necessity of the observance of the law, had so much increased that the Apostle called them fools and senseless; but, at the same time, he appealed to the proof which was presented by the spiritual gifts and miraculous powers, in which they had participated not through the observance of the law, but through faith in Christ (Gal. iii. 2, 5). Now, at that time the Charismata of teaching and knowledge must already have been weakened or extinguished in these communities, otherwise so strong an aberration would not be explicable. Nowhere, however, in this Epistle is there any trace of an established ministry; on the contrary, at the close the "spiritual" among them are instructed to administer the office of commination.

But, generally, from that time forward, the Charismatic state in the Church more and more disappeared, though single Charismata, and individuals endowed with the same, remained. In the first Epistle to the believers in Thessalonica, Paul had made it specially prominent that his Gospel had worked there not as mere word, but with demonstration of the power of the Holy Spirit (i. 5). In the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians there is no longer the slightest intimation of, or reference to, the Charismata, although in both communities the occasion for such an allusion was very appropriate—in Philippi through the Jewish opponents, and in Colossæ on account of the heretical dangers and the threatening Gnostic asceticism. On the other hand, in the Epistle to the Philippians bishops and deacons are already mentioned as ministers of the community. Then, in the Pastoral Epistles, not only is there no mention of the Charismata, but a state of the community is set forth which is wholly different from the Charismatic. The communities in Asia Minor, the Ephesian first of all, are partly threatened, partly unsettled by Gnostic heresies, strifes of words, foolish controversies, empty babbling about matters of faith, of doctrines of demons, of an advancing godlessness, corroding like a gangrene (1 Tim. iv. 1–3, vi. 3 f. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 14 f.). All the counsels which are here given to Timothy, the conduct in regard to these evils which is recommended to him, all is of a nature as though Charismata no longer existed to any extent, as though, in lieu of the first spiritual soaring and of the fulness of extraordinary powers manifesting itself in the community, the bare prose of the life of the Church had already set in."[1] Regarding this, it is not necessary for us to say more than that the representation which is everywhere made, in the Acts and elsewhere, and which seems to be confirmed by Paul, is that all the members of these Christian communities received the Holy Spirit, and the divine Charismata, but that nowhere have we evidence of any supernatural results produced by them. If, however, the view above expressed be accepted, the difficulty is increased; for, except in the allusions of the Apostle to Charismata, it is impossible to discover any difference between communities which had received miraculous spiritual "gifts" and those which had not done so. On the contrary, it might possibly be shown that a Church which had not been so endowed, perhaps, on the whole, exhibited higher spiritual qualities than another which was supposed to possess the Charismata. In none are we able to perceive any supernatural characteristics, or more than the very ordinary marks of a new religious life. It seems scarcely necessary to depart from the natural order of nature, and

[1] *Christenthum u. Kirche*, 1868, p. 300 f.

introduce the supernatural working of a Holy Spirit to produce such common-place results. We venture to say that there is nothing to justify the assertion of supernatural agency here, and that the special divine Charismata existed only in the pious imagination of the Apostle, who referred every good quality in man to divine grace.

We have reserved the gift of "tongues" for special discussion, because Paul enters into it with a fulness with which he does not treat any of the other Charismata, and a valuable opportunity is thus afforded us of ascertaining something definite with regard to the nature of the gift; and also because we have a narrative in the Acts of the Apostles of the first descent of the Holy Spirit, manifesting itself in "tongues," with which it may be instructive to compare the Apostle's remarks. We may mention that, in the opinion of many, the cause which induced the Apostle to say so much regarding Charismata in his first letter to the Corinthians was the circumstance, that many maintained the gift of tongues to be the only form of "the manifestation of the Spirit." This view is certainly favoured by the narrative in the Acts, in which not only at the first famous day of Pentecost, but on almost every occasion of the imposition of the Apostle's hands, this is the only gift mentioned as accompanying the reception of the Holy Spirit. In any case, it is apparent from the whole of the Apostle's homily on the subject that the gift of tongues was especially valued in the Church of Corinth.[1] It is difficult to conceive, on the supposition that amongst the Charismata there were comprised miraculous gifts of healings and power of working miracles, that these could have been held so cheap in comparison with the gift of tongues; but, in any case, a better comprehension of what this "gift" really

[1] Dean Stanley says: "It may easily be conceived that this new life was liable to much confusion and excitement, especially in a society where the principle of moral stability was not developed commensurably with it. Such was, we know, the state of Corinth. They had, on the one hand, been 'in everything enriched by Christ, in all utterance, and in all knowledge,' 'coming behind in no gift' (i. 5, 6, 7); but, on the other hand, the same contentious spirit which had turned the most sacred names into party watchwords, and profaned the celebration of the Supper of the Lord, was ready to avail itself of the openings for vanity and ambition afforded by the distinctions of the different gifts. Accordingly, various disorders arose; every one thought of himself, and no one of his neighbour's good; and, as a natural consequence, those gifts were most highly honoured, not which were most useful, but which were most astonishing. Amongst these the gift of tongues rose pre-eminent, as being in itself the most expressive of the new spiritual life; the very words, 'spiritual gifts,' 'spiritual man' (πνευματικά, xiv. 1; πνευματικός, xiv. 37), seem, in common parlance, to have been exclusively appropriated to it; and the other gifts, especially that of prophecy, were despised, as hardly proceeding from the same Divine source" (*The Eps. of St. P. to the Corinthians*, 1876, p. 210 f.). Imagine this state of things in a community endowed with so many supernatural gifts!

was cannot fail to assist us in understanding the true nature of the whole of the Charismata. It is evident that the Apostle Paul himself does not rank the gift of tongues very highly, and, indeed, that he seems to value prophecy more than all the other Charismata (xiv. 1 f.); but the simple yet truly noble eloquence with which (xiii. 1 f.) he elevates above all these gifts the possession of spiritual love is a subtle indication of their real character. Probably Paul would have termed Christian charity a gift of the Spirit as much as he does "gifts of healings" or "workings of powers"; but, however rare may be the virtue, it is not now recognised as miraculous, although it is here shown to be more desirable and precious than all the miraculous gifts. Even Apostolic conceptions of the Supernatural cannot soar above the range of natural morality.

The real nature of the "gift of tongues" has given rise to an almost interminable controversy, and innumerable treatises have been written upon the subject. It would have been impossible for us to have exhaustively entered upon such a discussion in this work, for which it only possesses an incidental and passing interest; but fortunately such a course is rendered unnecessary by the fact that, so far as we are concerned, the miraculous nature of the "gift" alone comes into question, and may be disposed of without any elaborate analysis of past controversy or minute reference to disputed points. Those who desire to follow the course of the voluminous discussion will find ample materials in the treatises which we shall at least indicate in the course of our remarks, and we shall adhere as closely as possible to our own point of view.

In 1 Cor. xii. 10 the Apostle mentions, amongst the other Charismata, "kinds of tongues" (*γένη γλωσσῶν*) and "interpretation of tongues" (*ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν*) as two distinct gifts. In verse 28 he again uses the expression *γένη γλωσσῶν*, and in a following verse he inquires: "Do all speak with tongues?" (*γλώσσαις λαλοῦσι*).[1] "Do all interpret?" (*διερμηνεύουσι*). He says shortly after, xiii. 1: "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels (*ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων*), and have not love," etc. In the following chapter the expressions used in discussing the gift vary. In xiv. 2 he says: "He that speaketh with a tongue"[2] (*λαλῶν γλώσσῃ*),[3] using the singular; and again (verse 22), of "the tongues" (*αἱ γλῶσσαι*), being a sign; and in verse 26 each "hath a tongue" (*γλῶσσαν ἔχει*). The word *γλῶσσα* or *γλῶττα* has several significations in Greek. The first and primary meaning "the tongue"—as a mere

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 5, 6, 18, 23, 39: Acts x. 46, xix. 6.

[2] The rendering of the Authorised Version, "an *unknown* tongue," is wholly imaginary. The "with" which we adopt is more frequently rendered "in"; it is a mere matter of opinion, of course, but we maintain "with."

[3] Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 4, 13, 14, 19, 27.

member of the body, the organ of speech; next, a tongue, or language; and further, an obsolete or foreign word not in ordinary use. If we inquire into the use of γλῶσσα in the New Testament, we find that, setting aside the passages in Acts, Mark, and 1 Cor. xii.-xiv., in which the phenomenon we are discussing is referred to, the word is invariably used in the first sense, "the tongue,"[1] except in the Apocalypse, where the word as "language" typifies different nations.[2] Anyone who attentively considers all the passages in which the Charisma is discussed will observe that no uniform application of any one signification throughout is possible. We may briefly say that all the attempts which have been made philologically to determine the true nature of the phenomenon which the Apostle discusses have failed to produce any really satisfactory result, or to secure the general adhesion of critics. It is, we think, obvious that Paul does not apply the word, either in the plural or in the singular, in its ordinary senses, but makes use of γλῶσσα to describe phenomena connected with speech, without intending strictly to apply it either to the tongue or to a definite language. We merely refer to this in passing, for it is certain that no philological discussion of the word can materially affect the case; and such an argument is of no interest for our inquiry. Each meaning has been adopted by critics and been made the basis for a different explanation of the phenomenon. Philology is incapable of finally solving such a problem.

From the time of Irenæus,[3] or at least of Origen, the favourite theory of the Fathers, based chiefly upon the narrative in Acts of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, was that the disciples suddenly became supernaturally endowed with power to speak other languages which they had not previously learned, and that this gift was more especially conferred to facilitate the promulgation of the Gospel throughout the world. Augustine went so far as to believe that each of the Apostles was thus enabled to speak all languages.[4] The opinion that the "gift of tongues" consisted of the power, miraculously conferred by the Holy Ghost, to speak in a language or languages previously unknown to the speaker long continued to prevail, and it is still the popular, as well as the orthodox, view of the subject. As soon as the attention of critics was seriously directed to the question, however, this interpretation became rapidly modified, or was altogether aban-

[1] Mark vii. 33, 35; Luke i. 64, xvi. 24; Acts ii. 3, 26; Rom. iii. 13, xiv. 11; Philip. ii. 11; James, i. 26, iii. 5, 6 (twice), 8; 1 Pet. iii. 10; 1 John iii. 18; cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 1; *Apoc.*, xvi. 10.

[2] *Apoc.*, v. 9, vii. 9, x. 11, xi. 9, xiii. 7, xiv. 6, xvii. 15.

[3] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, v. 6, § 1, Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 7.

[4] *De Verb. Apost.*, clxxv. 3; *Serm.* 9: "*Loquebatur enim tunc unus homo omnibus linguis, quia locutura erat unitas ecclesiæ in omnibus linguis.*"

doned. It is unnecessary for us to refer in detail to the numerous explanations which have been given of the phenomenon, or to enumerate the extraordinary views which have been expressed regarding it; it will be sufficient if, without reference to minor differences of opinion respecting the exact form in which it exhibited itself, we broadly state that a great majority of critics, rejecting the theory that γλώσσαις λαλεῖν means to speak languages previously unknown to the speakers, pronounce it to be the speech of persons in a state of ecstatic excitement, chiefly of the nature of prayer or praise, and unintelligible to ordinary hearers. Whether this speech consisted of mere inarticulate tones, of excited ejaculations, of obsolete or uncommon expressions and provincialisms, of highly poetical rhapsodies of prayer in slow, scarcely audible, accents, or of chaunted mysterious phrases, fragmentary and full of rapturous intensity, as these critics variously suppose, we shall not pause to inquire. It is clear that, whatever may have been the form of the speech, if, instead of being speech in unlearnt languages supernaturally communicated, γλώσσαις λαλεῖν was only the expression of religious excitement, however that may be supposed to have originated, the pretensions of the gift to a miraculous character shrink at once into exceedingly small proportions.

Every unprejudiced mind must admit that the representation that the gift of "tongues," of which the Apostle speaks in his Epistle to the Corinthians, conferred upon the recipient the power to speak foreign languages before unknown to him, may in great part be traced to the narrative in Acts of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. Although a few Apologists advance the plea that there may have been differences in the manifestation, it is generally recognised on both sides that, however differently described by the two writers, the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν of Paul and of the Acts is, in reality, one and the same phenomenon. The impression conveyed by the narrative has been applied to the didactic remarks of Paul, and a meaning forced upon them which they cannot possibly bear. It is not too much to say that, but for the mythical account in the Acts, no one would ever have supposed that the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν of Paul was the gift of speaking foreign languages without previous study or practice. In the interminable controversy regarding the phenomenon, moreover, it seems to us to have been a fundamental error, on both sides too often, to have considered it necessary to the acceptance of any explanation that it should equally suit both the remarks of Paul and the account in Acts. The only right course is to test the narrative by the distinct and authoritative statements of the Apostle; but to adopt the contrary course is much the same procedure as altering the natural interpretation of an original historical document in order to make it agree with the romance of

some unknown writer of a later day. The Apostle Paul writes as a contemporary and eye-witness of phenomena which affected himself, and regarding which he gives the most valuable direct and indirect information. The unknown author of the Acts was not an eye-witness of the scene which he describes, and his narrative bears upon its very surface the clearest marks of traditional and legendary treatment. The ablest Apologists freely declare that the evidence of Paul is of infinitely greater value than that of the unknown and later writer, and must be preferred before it. The majority of those who profess to regard the narrative as historical explain away its clearest statements with startling ingenuity, or conceal them beneath a cloud of words. The references to the phenomenon in later portions of the Acts are in themselves quite inconsistent with the earlier narrative in chapter ii. The detailed criticism of Paul is the only contemporary, and it is certainly the only trustworthy, account we possess regarding the gift of "tongues."[1]. We must, therefore, dismiss from our minds, if possible, the bias which the narrative in the Acts has unfortunately created, and attend solely to the words of the Apostle. If his report of the phenomenon discredit that of the unknown and later writer, so much the worse for the latter. In any case, it is the testimony of Paul which is referred to and which we are called upon to consider, and later writers must not be allowed to invest it with impossible meanings. Even if we had not such undeniable reasons for preferring the statements of Paul to the later and untrustworthy narrative of an unknown writer, the very contents of the latter, contrasted with the more sober remarks of the Apostle, would consign it to a very subordinate place.

Discussing the miracle of Pentecost in Acts, which he, of course, regards as the instantaneous communication of ability to speak in foreign languages, Zeller makes the following remarks: "The supposition of such a miracle is opposed to a right view of divine agency and the relation of God to the world, and, in this case in particular, to a right view of the constitution of the human mind. The composition and the properties of a body may be altered through external influence, but mental acquirements are attained only through personal activity, through practice; and it is just in this that spirit distinguishes itself from matter: that it is free, that there is nothing in it which it has not itself spontaneously introduced. The external and instantaneous in-pouring of a mental acquirement is a representation which refutes itself." In reply to those who object to this reasoning, he retorts: "The assertion that such a miracle actually occurred contradicts the analogy of all attested

[1] We need not here say anything of the reference in Mark xvi. 17, which is undoubtedly a later and spurious addition to the Gospel.

experience; that it is invented by an individual or by tradition corresponds with it; when, therefore, the historical writer has only the choice between these two alternatives, he must, according to the laws of historical probability, under all the circumstances, unconditionally decide for the second. He must do this even if an eye-witness of the pretended miracle stood before him; he must all the more do so if he has to do with a statement which, beyond doubt not proceeding from an eye-witness, is more possibly separated by some generations from the event in question."[1]

These objections are not confined to rationalistic critics, and do not merely represent the arguments of scepticism. Neander expresses similar sentiments,[2] and after careful examination pronounces the narrative in Acts untrustworthy, and, adhering to the representations of Paul, rejects the theory that γλώσσαις λαλεῖν was speech in foreign languages supernaturally imparted. Meyer, who arrives at much the same result as Neander, speaks still more emphatically. He says: "*This* supposed gift of tongues (all languages), however, was in the apostolic age, partly *unnecessary* for the preaching of the Gospel, as the preachers thereof only required to be able to speak Hebrew and Greek; partly *too general*, as amongst the assembly there were certainly many who were not called to be teachers. And, on the other hand, again, it would also have been *premature*, as, before all, Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles would have required it, in whom, nevertheless, there is as little trace of any *subsequent* reception of it as that he preached otherwise than in Hebrew and Greek. *But now, how is the event to be historically judged?* Regarding this the following is to be observed: As the instantaneous bestowal of facility in a foreign language is neither logically possible nor psychologically and morally conceivable, and as not the slightest intimation of such a thing in the Apostles is perceptible in their Epistles and elsewhere (on the contrary, comp. xiv. 11); as, further, if it was only momentary, the impossibility increases, and as Peter himself in his speech does not once make the slightest reference to the foreign languages; therefore—whether, without any intimation in the text, one consider that Pentecost assembly as a representation of all future Christianity, or not—the occurrence, as Luke relates it, cannot be transmitted in its actual historical details."[3]

Let us a little examine the particulars of the narrative in Acts ii. All the brethren were assembled in one place, a house (οἶκος), on the morning of the day of Pentecost. In the preceding chapter (i. 15) we learn that the number of disciples was then about 120, and the crowd which came together when

[1] Zeller, *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 85 f. [2] *Pflanzung, u. s. w.*, p. 16.
[3] Meyer, *Kr. ex. H'buch üb. die Apostelgesch.*, 4te aufl., 1870, p. 54 f.

the miraculous occurrence took place must have been great, seeing that it is stated that 3,000 souls were baptised and added to the Church upon the occasion (ii. 41). Passing over the statement as to the numbers of the disciples, which might well surprise us after the information given by the Gospels,[1] we may ask in what house in Jerusalem could such a multitude have assembled? Apologists have exhausted their ingenuity in replying to the question, but whether placing the scene in one of the halls or courts of the Temple, or in an imaginary house in one of the streets leading to the Temple, the explanation is equally vague and unsatisfactory. How did the multitude so rapidly know of what was passing in a private house? We shall say nothing at present of the sound of the "rushing mighty wind" which filled all the house, nor of the descent of the "tongues as of fire," nor of the various interpretations of these phenomena by apologetic writers. These incidents do not add to the historical character of the narrative, nor can it be pronounced either clear or consistent. The brethren assembled "were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues (λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις), as the Spirit gave them utterance."[2] Apologists, in order somewhat to save the historical credit of the account and reconcile it with the statements of Paul, have variously argued that there is no affirmation made in the narrative that speech in foreign languages previously unknown was imparted. The members of the fifteen nations who hear the Galilæans speaking "in our own language wherein we were born" (τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ ἡμῶν ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθημεν) are disposed of with painful ingenuity; but, passing over all this, it is recognised by unprejudiced critics on both sides that at least the author of Acts, in writing this account, intended to represent the brethren as instantaneously speaking those previously unknown foreign languages. A few writers represent the miracle to have been one of hearing rather than of speaking, the brethren merely praising God in their own tongue, the Aramaic, but the spectators understanding in their various languages.[3] This only shifts the difficulty from the speakers to the hearers, and the explanation is generally repudiated. It is, however, freely granted by all that history does not exhibit a single instance of such a gift of tongues having ever been made useful for the purpose of preaching the Gospel. Paul, who claimed the possession of the gift of tongues in a superlative degree (1 Cor. xiv. 18), does not appear to have spoken more languages than Aramaic and Greek.

[1] John xvi. 31; Matt. xxviii. 7. [2] Acts ii. 4.

[3] Schneckenburger, *Beiträge*, p. 84; Svensen, *Zeitschr. luth. Th. u. Kirche*, 1859, p. 1 f. This view was anciently held by Gregory Naz. (*Orat.* 44), and some of the Fathers, and, in more recent times, it was adopted by Erasmus and others.

He writes to the Romans in the latter tongue, and not in Latin, and to the Galatians in the same language instead of their own. Peter, who appears to have addressed the assembled nations in Greek on this very occasion, does not in his speech either refer to foreign languages or claim the gift himself, for in verse 15 he speaks only of others: "For *these* (οὗτοι) are not drunken." Every one remembers the ancient tradition recorded by Papias, and generally believed by the Fathers, that Mark accompanied Peter as his "interpreter" (ἑρμηνευτής).[1] The first Epistle bearing the name of Peter, and addressed to some of the very nations mentioned in Acts, to sojourners "in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," is written in Greek; and so are the Epistle to the Hebrews and the other works of the New Testament. Few will be inclined to deny that, to take only one language for instance, the Greek of the writings of the New Testament leaves something to be desired, and that, if the writers possessed such a supernatural gift, they evidently did not speak even so important and current a language with absolute purity. "*Le style des écrivains sacrés*," writes a modern Apologist, "*montre clairement qu'ils ont appris la langue grecque et qu'ils ne la possèdent pas de droit divin et par inspiration, car ils l'écrivent sans correction, en la surchargeant de locutions hébraïques.*"[2] In fact, as most critics point out, there never was a period at which a gift of foreign tongues was less necessary for intercourse with the civilised world, Greek being almost everywhere current. As regards the fifteen nations who are supposed to have been represented on this great occasion, Neander says: "It is certain that amongst the inhabitants of towns in Cappadocia, in Pontus, in Asia Minor, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Cyrene, and in the parts of Libya and Egypt peopled by Greek and Jewish colonies, the Greek language was in great part more current than the old national tongue. There remain, out of the whole catalogue of languages, at most the Persian, Syriac, Arabic, Greek, and Latin. The more rhetorical than historical stamp of the narrative is evident."[3]

This rhetorical character, as contradistinguished from sober history, is, indeed, painfully apparent throughout. The presence in Jerusalem of Jews, devout men "from every nation under heaven," is dramatically opportune, and thus representatives of the fifteen nations are prepared to appear in the house and hear their own languages in which they were born spoken in so supernatural,

[1] Cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39, v. 8; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 1, § 1; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5.

[2] De Pressensé, *Hist. des Trois prem. Siècles*, i., p. 356. Neander (*Pflanzung, u. s. w.*, p. 14 f.), Reuss (*Rev. d. Théol.*, 1851, iii., p. 84 f.), and many other able writers, still more strongly enforce these arguments.

[3] Neander, *Pflanzung, u. s. w.*, p. 18.

though useless, a manner by the brethren. They are all said to have been "confounded" at the phenomenon, and the writer adds (ii. 7 f.): "And they were all amazed, and marvelled, saying, Behold, are not all these which speak Galilæans? And how hear we every man in our own language wherein we were born?" etc. Did all the multitude say this? or is not the writer merely ascribing probable sentiments to them? How, again, did they know that the hundred and twenty, or more, brethren were Galilæans? Further on the writer adds more of the same kind (verses 12, 13): "And they were all amazed and were in doubt, saying one to another, What may this mean? But others, mocking, said: They are full of sweet wine." Is it not a strange manner of accounting for such a phenomenon as (verse 11) hearing people speaking in their own tongues the great works of God to suppose that they are drunken? People speaking with tongues, in Paul's sense (1 Cor. xiv. 23, 24, 33), and creating an unintelligible tumult, might well lead strangers to say that they were either mad or drunken; but the praise of God in foreign language, understood by so many, could not convey such an impression. Peter does not, in explanation, simply state that they are speaking foreign languages which have just been supernaturally imparted to them, but argues (verse 15) that "these are not drunken, as ye suppose, for it is the third hour of the day," too early to be "full of sweet wine," and proceeds to assert that the phenomenon is, on the contrary, a fulfilment of a prophecy of Joel, in which, although the pouring out of God's Spirit upon all flesh is promised "in the last days," and, as a result, that "your sons and your daughters shall prophesy and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams," not a single word is said of any gift of "tongues," foreign or otherwise. The miraculous phenomenon in question is not mentioned in the prophecy, of which it is supposed to be the accomplishment. It does not much help matters to argue that the miracle, although not for future use, was intended as a sign. We shall see what Paul says regarding γλώσσαις λαλεῖν as a sign, but we may here merely point out that the effect produced in the Corinthian Church is rather an impression of madness, whilst here it leads to a mocking accusation of drunkenness. The conversion of the 3,000 is by no means referred to the speaking with tongues, but simply to the speech of Peter (ii. 37 f., 41). From no point of view is there cohesion between the different parts of the narrative; it is devoid of verisimilitude. It is not surprising that so many critics of all shades of opinion recognise unhistorical elements in the narrative in Acts, not to use a stronger term. To allow such an account to influence our interpretation of Paul's statements regarding the gift of tongues is quite out of the question; and no one who appreciates the nature of

the case, and who carefully examines the narrative of the unknown writer, can, we think, hesitate to reject his theory of a supernatural bestowal of power to speak foreign languages.

It is not difficult to trace the origin of the account in Acts, and, although we cannot here pause to do so with any minuteness, we may at least indicate the lines upon which the narrative is based. There is no doubt that then, as now, the Jews commemorated at the feast of Pentecost the giving of the law on Sinai. It seemed good to the author of Acts that the prophet like unto Moses,[1] who was to abrogate that law and replace it by a dispensation of grace, should inaugurate the new law of love and liberty[2] with signs equally significant and miraculous. It is related in Exodus xix. 18 that the Lord descended upon Sinai "in fire," and that the whole mount quaked greatly. The voice of God pronounced the decalogue, and, as the Septuagint version renders our Exodus xx. 18: "All the people saw the voice, and the lightnings and the voice of the trumpet and the mountain smoking." According to Rabbinical tradition when God came down to give the law to the Israelites, he appeared not to Israel alone, but to all the other nations, and the voice in which the law was given went to the ends of the earth and was heard of all peoples.[3] It will be remembered that the number of the nations was supposed to be seventy, each speaking a different language, and the law was given in the one sacred Hebrew tongue. The Rabbins explained, however: "The voice from Sinai was divided into seventy voices and seventy languages, so that all nations of the earth heard (the law), and each heard it actually in its own language."[4] And again: "Although the ten commandments were promulgated with one single tone, yet it is said (Exodus xx. 15), 'All people heard the voices' (in the plural and not the voice in the singular); 'the reason is: As the voice went forth it was divided into seven voices, and then into seventy tongues, and every people heard the Law in its own mother-tongue.'"[5] The same explanation is given of Psalm lxviii. 11, and the separation of the voice into seven voices and seventy tongues is likened to the sparks beaten by a hammer from molten metal on the anvil.[6] Philo expresses the same ideas in several places. We can only extract one passage in which, speaking of the giving of the law on Sinai, and discussing the manner in which God proclaimed the decalogue, he says: "For God is not like a man in need of a voice and of a tongue.....but it seems to me that at that time he performed a most holy and

[1] Acts iii. 22, vii. 37. [2] Cf. Gal. iv. 21 f.
[3] *Bab. Sevachim*, 116 a.; Gfrörer, *Das Jahrh. des Heils*, ii. 392 f.
[4] *Schemoth Rabba*, 70 d.; Gfrörer, *ib.*, ii. 393.
[5] *Midrash Tanchumah*, 26, c.; Gfrörer, *ib.*, ii. 393.
[6] *Midrash Tillin*; *Bab. Schabbath*, 85 b.; Gfrörer, *ib.*, ii. 393 f.

beseeming wonder, commanding an invisible voice to be created in air, more wonderful than all instruments.....not lifeless, but neither a form of living creature composed of body and soul, but a reasonable soul full of clearness and distinctness, which formed and excited the air and transformed it into flaming fire, and sounded forth such an articulated voice, like breath through a trumpet, that it seemed to be equally heard by those who were near and those furthest off."[1] A little further on he says: "But from the midst of the fire streaming from heaven a most awful voice sounded forth, the flame being articulated to language familiar to the hearers, which made that which was said so vividly clear as to seem rather seeing than hearing it."[2] It requires no elaborate explanation to show how this grew into the miracle at Pentecost at the inauguration of the Christian dispensation, when suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind which filled all the house where the disciples were, and there appeared to them tongues as of fire parting asunder which sat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues, even as the Spirit gave them utterance, so that devout men from every nation under heaven heard them speaking, everyone in his own language wherein he was born, the great works of God.

When we turn to the other passages in the Acts where the gift of tongues is mentioned, we find that the interpretation of foreign languages supernaturally imparted is quite out of place. When Peter is sent to Cornelius, as he is addressing the centurion and his household, and even before they are baptised (x. 44), "the Holy Spirit fell on all them who hear the word"; and the sign of it is (v. 46) that they are heard "speaking with tongues and magnifying God" (*λαλούντων γλώσσαις καὶ μεγαλυνόντων τὸν θεόν*), precisely like the disciples at Pentecost (cf. ii. 11, xi. 15 f.). As this gift fell on all who heard the word (x. 44), it could not be a sign to unbelievers; and the idea that Cornelius and his house immediately began to speak in foreign languages, which, as in the case of the Corinthians, probably no one understood, instead of simply "magnifying God" in their own tongue, which everyone understood, is almost ludicrous, if without offence we may venture to say so. The same remarks apply to xix. 6. We must again allow an eminent Apologist, who will not be accused of irreverence, to characterise such a representation. "Now, in such positions and such company, speech in foreign tongues would be something altogether without object and without meaning.

[1] *De decem Oraculis*, § 9, ed. Mangey, ii. 185 f.

[2] *Ib.*, § 11, ed. Mangey, ii. 188; cf. *De Septenario et festis*, § 22, ed. Mangey, ii. 295 f.

Where the consciousness of the grace of salvation, and of a heavenly life springing from it, is first aroused in man, his own mother tongue verily, not a foreign language, will be the natural expression of his feelings. Or we must imagine a magical power which, taking possession of men, like instruments without volition, forces them to utter strange tones—a thing contradicting all analogy in the operations of Christianity."[1] The good sense of the critic revolts against the natural submission of the Apologist.

We have diverged so far in order prominently to bring before the reader the nature and source of the hypothesis that the gift of "tongues" signifies instantaneous power to speak unlearnt foreign languages. Such an interpretation is derived almost entirely from the mythical narrative in the Acts of the Apostles. We shall now proceed to consider the statements of the Apostle Paul, and endeavour to ascertain what the supposed miraculous Charisma really is. That it is something very different from what the unknown writer represents it in the episode of Pentecost cannot be doubted. "Whoever has, even once, read with attention what Paul writes of the speaking with tongues in the Corinthian community," writes Thiersch, "knows that the difference between that gift of tongues and this (of Acts ii.) could scarcely be greater. There, a speech which no mortal can understand without interpretation, and also no philologist but the Holy Spirit alone can interpret; here, a speech which requires no interpretation. That gift serves only for the edification of the speaker; this clearly also for that of the hearer. The one is of no avail for the instruction of the ignorant; the other, clearly, is imparted wholly for that purpose."[2]

It may be well that we should state a few reasons which show that Paul, in his first letter to the Corinthians, does not intend, in speaking of γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, to represent speech in foreign languages. In the very outset of the dissertation on the subject, (xiv. 2), Paul very distinctly declares as the principal reason for preferring prophecy to the gift of tongues: "For he that speaketh with a tongue (λαλῶν γλώσσῃ) speaketh not unto men, but unto God; for no one understandeth[3] (οὐδεὶς ἀκούει)." How could this be said if γλώσσῃ λαλεῖν meant merely speaking a foreign language? The presence of a single person versed in the language spoken would, in such a case, vitiate the whole of Paul's argument.

[1] Neander, *Pflanzung, u. s. w.*, p. 19.

[2] Thiersch, *Die Kirche im apost. Zeitalter*, 2te aufl., 1858, p. 68 f.

[3] The literal meaning, of course, is "no one heareth"; but the sense is "heareth *with the understanding*." Cf. Mark iv. 33 and the lxx. version of Gen. xi. 7, Isaiah xxxvi. 11, etc., where ἀκούειν has this meaning. The word is rightly rendered in the A. V.

The statement made is general, it will be observed, and not limited to one community; but, applied to a place like Corinth, one of the greatest commercial cities, in which merchants, seamen, and visitors of all countries were to be found, it would have been unreasonable to have characterised a foreign tongue as absolutely unintelligible. In xiv. 9, Paul says: "So likewise ye, unless ye utter by the tongue (διὰ τῆς γλώσσης) words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye will be speaking into air." How could Paul use the expression, "by the tongue," if he meant a foreign language in verse 2 and elsewhere? He is comparing γλώσσαις λαλεῖν in the preceding verses with the sounds of musical instruments, and the point reached in verse 9 clearly brings home the application of his argument—the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν is unintelligible, like the pipe or harp, and, unless the tongue utter words which have an understood meaning, it is mere speaking into air. Is it possible that Paul could call speech in a language foreign to him, perhaps, but which, nevertheless, was the mother tongue of some nation, "speaking into air"? In such case he must have qualified his statement by obvious explanations, of which not a word appears throughout his remarks. That he does not speak of foreign languages is made still more clear by the next two verses (verse 10), in which, continuing his argument from analogy, he actually compares γλώσσαις λαλεῖν with speech in foreign languages, and ends (verse 11): "If, therefore, I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian (foreigner) and he that speaketh a barbarian (foreigner) in my judgment."[1] Paul's logic is certainly not always beyond reproach, but he cannot be accused of perpetrating such an antithesis as contrasting a thing with itself. He, therefore, explicitly distinguishes (verse 10) γένη φωνῶν, "kinds of languages,"[2] from (xii. 10, 28, etc.) γένη γλωσσῶν, "kinds of tongues." In xiv. 6 Paul says: "If I come unto you speaking with tongues (γλώσσαις λαλῶν), what shall I profit you, unless I shall speak to you, either in revelation, or knowledge, or in prophecy, or in teaching?" (ἐν ἀποκαλύψει ἢ ἐν γνώσει ἢ ἐν προφητείᾳ ἢ ἐν διδαχῇ); and then he goes on to compare such unintelligible speech with musical instruments. It is obvious that revelation, knowledge, prophecy, and teaching might equally be expressed in foreign languages, and, therefore, in "speaking with tongues" it is no mere difficulty of expression which makes it unprofitable, but that general unintelligibility which is the ground of the whole of Paul's objections. Paul exclaims (verse 18): "I thank God I

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 11.

[2] It is unnecessary to show that φωνή is used to express language.

speak with a tongue (γλώσσῃ λαλῶ)[1] more than ye all (19), but in a church I would rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may teach others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue (ἐν γλώσσῃ)."[2] We have already pointed out that there is no evidence that Paul could speak many languages. So far as we have any information, he only made use of Greek and Aramaic, and never even preached where those languages were not current. He always employed the former in his Epistles, whether addressed to Corinth, Galatia, or Rome, and his knowledge even of that language was not perfect. Speaking "with a tongue" cannot, for reasons previously given, mean a foreign language; and this is still more obvious from what he says in verse 19, just quoted, in which he distinguishes speaking with a tongue from speaking with his understanding. Five words so spoken are better than ten thousand in a tongue, because he speaks with the understanding in the one case, and without it in the second. It is clear that a man speaks with his understanding as much in one language as another, but it is the main characteristic of the speech we are discussing that it is throughout opposed to understanding—cf. verses 14, 15. It would be inconceivable that, if this gift really signified power to speak foreign languages, Paul could, on the one hand, use the expressions in this letter with regard to it, and, on the other, that he could have failed to add remarks consistent with such an interpretation. For instance, is it possible that the Apostle, in repressing the exercise of the Charisma, as he does, could have neglected to point out some other use for it than mere personal edification? Could he have omitted to tell some of these speakers with tongues that, instead of wasting their languages in a Church where no one understood them, it would be well for them to employ them in the instruction of the nations whose tongues had been supernaturally imparted to them? As it is, Paul checks the use of a gift bestowed by the Holy Spirit, and reduces its operation to the smallest limits, without once indicating so obvious a sphere of usefulness for the miraculous power. We need not proceed to further arguments upon this branch of the subject; although, in treating other points, additional evidence will constantly present itself. For the reasons we have stated, and many others, the great majority of critics are agreed that the gift of tongues, according to Paul, was not the power of speaking foreign languages previously unknown.[3] But for the narrative

[1] This is the reading of A, D, E, F, G, ℵ, and other ancient codices, and is adopted by most critics in preference to γλώσσαις, the reading of B, K, L.

[2] 1 Cor. xiv. 18, 19.

[3] So Bardili, Baur, Bleek, Davidson, Eichhorn, Ewald, Fritzsche, Gfrörer, Hausrath, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Keim, Meyer, Neander, Noack, Olshausen,

in Acts ii. no one would ever have thought of such an interpretation.

Coming now to consider the two Charismata, "kinds of tongues" and "the interpretation of tongues," more immediately in connection with our inquiry, as so-called miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, we shall first endeavour to ascertain some of their principal characteristics. The theory of foreign languages supernaturally imparted without previous study may be definitively laid aside. The interpretation of tongues may go with it, but requires a few observations. It is clear from Paul's words throughout this dissertation that the interpretation of tongues not only was not invariably attached to the gift of tongues[1] (1 Cor. xiv. 13, 27, 28), but was at least often a separate gift possessed without the kinds of tongues (cf. xii. 10, 28, xiv. 26, 28). Nothing can be more specific than xii. 10: ".....to another, kinds of tongues; and to another, interpretation of tongues"; and again, verse 30: "Do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" This is indeed presaged by the "diversities of gifts," etc., of xii. 4 f. Upon the hypothesis of foreign languages, this would presuppose that some spoke languages which they could not interpret, and consequently could not understand, and that others understood languages which they could not speak. The latter point is common enough in ordinary life; but, in this instance, the miracle of supernaturally receiving a perfect knowledge of languages, instantaneously and without previous study, is as great as to receive the power to speak them. The anomaly in the miracle, merely to point out a suggestive discrepancy where all is anomalous, is that the gift of tongues should ever have been separated from the gift of interpretation. If a man understand the foreign language he speaks, he can interpret it; if he cannot interpret it, he cannot understand it; and if he cannot understand it, can he possibly speak it? Certainly not, without his having been made a perfectly mechanical instrument through which, apart from the understanding and the will, sounds are involuntarily produced, which is not to be entertained. Still pursuing the same hypothesis—the one gift is to speak languages which no one understands, the other to understand languages which no one speaks. Paul never even assumes the probability that the

Overbeck, Paulus, Pfleiderer, de Pressensé, Renan, Reuss, Schaff, Schrader, Schulz, Schwegler, Stap, Steudel, De Wette, Wieseler, Weisse, Zeller, and others.

[1] Ewald maintains that "interpretation" was always separate from "tongues" (*Die Sendschr des Ap. Paul.*, p. 205, anm.). Wieseler at one time (*St. u. Krit.*, 1838, p. 720 f.) asserted that the speaker with tongues was always his own interpreter. He subsequently (*St. u. Krit.*, 1860, p. 117 f.) withdrew this extraordinary theory.

"tongue" spoken is understood by any one except the interpreter. The interpretation of such obscure tongues must have been a gift very little used—never, indeed, except as the complement to the gift of tongues. The natural and useful facility in languages is apparently divided into two supernatural and useless halves. The idea is irresistibly suggested, as apparently it was to the Apostle himself, whether it would not have been more for the good of mankind and for the honour of Christianity if, instead of these two miraculously incomplete gifts, a little natural good sense, five words even, to be spoken in the vernacular tongue and requiring no interpretation, had been imparted. If, instead of foreign languages, we substitute the utterance of ecstatic religious excitement, the anomaly of speaking a language without understanding it or being understood becomes intelligible; and equally so the interpretation, unaccompanied by the power of speaking. It is obvious in both cases that, as no one understands the tongue, no one can determine whether the interpretation of it be accurate or not. But it is easily conceivable that a sympathetic nervous listener might suppose that he understood the broken and incoherent speech of ecstasy, and might interpret it according to his own stimulated imagination. The mysterious and unknown are suggestive texts, and there is nothing more infectious than religious excitement. In all this, however, is there anything miraculous?

We need not further demonstrate that the chief and general characteristic of "kinds of tongues" was that they were unintelligible (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 2, 6–11, 13–19). Speaking with the spirit (πνεῦμα) is opposed to speaking with the understanding (νοῦς) (cf. verses 14–16, etc.). They were not only unintelligible to others, but the speaker himself did not understand what he uttered: (verse 14) "For if I pray with a tongue (γλώσσῃ) my spirit (πνεῦμα) prayeth, but my understanding (νοῦς) is unfruitful" (cf. 15 f., 19). We have already pointed out that Paul speaks of these Charismata in general, and not as affecting the Corinthians only; and we must now add that he obviously does not even insinuate that the "kinds of tongues" possessed by that community was a spurious Charisma, or that any attempt had been made to simulate the gift; for nothing could have been more simple than for the Apostle to denounce such phenomena as false, and to distinguish the genuine from the imitated speech with tongues. The most convincing proof that his remarks refer to the genuine Charisma is that the Apostle applies to himself the very same restrictions in the use of "tongues" as he enforces upon the Corinthians (verses 18–19, 6, etc.), and characterises his own gift precisely as he does theirs (verses 6, 11, 14, 15, 19).

Now, what was the actual operation of this singular miraculous

gift, and its utility whether as regards the community or the gifted individual? Paul restricts the speaking of "tongues" in church because, being unintelligible, it is not for edification (xiv. 2 f., 18 f., 23, 27, 28). He himself does not make use of his gift for the assemblies of believers (verses 6, 18). Another ground upon which he objects to the use of "kinds of tongues" in public is that all the gifted apparently speak at once (verses 23, 27 f., 33). It will be remembered that all the Charismata and their operations are described as due to the direct agency of the Holy Spirit (xii. 4 f.); and immediately following their enumeration, ending with "kinds of tongues" and "interpretation of tongues," the Apostle resumes (verse 11), "but all these worketh one and the same Spirit, dividing to each severally as he wills"; and in Acts ii. 4 the brethren are represented as speaking with tongues "as the Spirit gave them utterance." Now, the first thought which presents itself is: How can a gift which is due to the direct working of the Holy Spirit possibly be abused? We must remember clearly that the speech is not expressive of the understanding of the speaker. The πνευματικοί spoke under the inspiration of the supernatural Agent, that which neither they nor others understood. Is it permissible to suppose that the Holy Spirit could inspire speech with tongues at an unfitting time? Can we imagine that this Spirit can actually have prompted many people to speak at one and the same time to the utter disturbance of order? Is not such a gift of tongues more like the confusion of tongues in Babel[1] than a christian Charisma? "And the Lord said: .....Go to, let us go down and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech."[2]

In spite of his abstract belief in the divine origin of the Charisma, Paul's language unconsciously betrays practical doubt as to its character. Does not such sarcasm as the following seem extremely indecorus when criticising a result produced directly by the Holy Spirit? (xiv. 23) "If, therefore, the whole church be come into one place and all speak with tongues, and there come in unlearned and unbelieving persons, will they not say ye are mad?" At Pentecost such an assembly was supposed to be drunken.[3] The whole of the counsel of the Apostle upon this occasion really amounts to an injunction to quench the Spirit. It is quite what might be expected in the case of the excitement of ecstatic religion, that the strong emotion should principally find vent in the form of prayer and praise (verse 15 f.); equally so that it should be unintelligible, and that no one should know when to say "Amen" (verse 16), and that all

[1] Cf. Schrader, *Der Ap. Paulus*, ii., p. 72 f. [2] Gen. xi. 6, 7.
[3] The same gift, it is generally understood, is referred to in Ephes. v. 18 f.

should speak at once; and still more so that the practical result should be tumult (verses 23, 33). All this, it might appear, could be produced without the intervention of the Holy Spirit. So far, is there any utility in the miracle?

But we are told that it is "for a sign." Paul argues upon this point in a highly eccentric manner. He quotes (v. 21) Isaiah xxviii. 11, 12, in a form neither agreeing with the Septuagint nor with the Hebrew—a passage which has merely a superficial and verbal analogy with the gift of tongues, but whose real historical meaning has no reference to it whatever: "In the Law it is written, that with men of other tongues and with the lips of others will I speak unto this people; and yet for all that they will not hear me, saith the Lord." The Apostle continues with singular logic: "So that (ὥστε) the tongues are for a sign (εἰς σημεῖον) not to those who believe, but to the unbelieving; but prophecy is not for the unbelieving, but for those who believe. If, therefore, the whole Church be come into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in unlearned or unbelieving persons, will they not say that ye are mad? But if all prophesy and there come in an unbeliever.....he is convicted by all.....and so falling on his face he will worship God, reporting that God is indeed in you." The Apostle himself shows that the tongues cannot be considered a sign by unbelievers, upon whom, apparently, they produce no other impression than that the speakers are mad or drunken.

Under any circumstances, the "kinds of tongues" described by the Apostle are a very sorry specimen of the "signs and wonders and powers" of which we have heard so much. It is not surprising that the Apostle prefers exhortation in a familiar tongue. In an ecstatic state, men are incapable of edifying others; we shall presently see how far they can edify themselves. Paul utters the pith of the whole matter at the very outset of his homily, when he prefers exhortation to kinds of tongues: verse 2. "For he that speaketh with a tongue speaketh not unto men, but unto God; for no one understandeth, but in Spirit he speaketh mysteries" (λαλεῖ μυστήρια). It is not possible to read his words without the impression that the Apostle treats the whole subject with suppressed impatience. His mind was too prone to believe in spiritual mysteries, and his nervous nature too susceptible to religious emotion and enthusiasm, to permit him clearly to recognise the true character of the gift of "tongues"; but his good sense asserted itself, and, after protesting that he would rather speak five words with his understanding than ten thousand words in a tongue, he breaks off with the characteristic exclamation (verse 20), "Brethren, become not children in your minds" (μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν). The advice is not yet out of place.

What was the private utility or advantage of the supernatural

gift? How did he who spoke with a tongue edify himself? (verse 4). Paul clearly states that he does not edify the Church (verse 2 f.). In the passage just quoted the Apostle, however, says that the speaker "with a tongue" "speaketh to God"; and further on (verses 18, 19) he implies that, although he himself does not use the gift in public, he does so in private. He admonishes (verse 28) any one gifted with tongues, if there be no interpreter present, to "keep silence in a church, but let him speak to himself and to God." But in what does the personal edification of the individual consist? In employing language, which he does not comprehend, in private prayer and praise? In addressing God in some unintelligible jargon, in the utterance of which his understanding has no part? Many strange purposes and proceedings have been attributed to the Supreme Being, but probably none has been imagined more incongruous than a gift of tongues unsuitable for the edification of others, and not intelligible to the recipient, but considered an edifying substitute in private devotion for his own language. This was certainly not the form of prayer which Jesus taught his disciples.[1] And this gift was valued more highly in the Corinthian Church than all the rest! Do we not get an instructive insight into the nature of the other Charismata from this suggestive fact? The reality of miracles does not seem to be demonstrated by these chapters.[2]

We have already stated that the vast majority of critics explain γλώσσαις λαλεῖν as speech in an ecstatic condition; and all the phenomena described by Paul closely correspond with the utterance of persons in a state of extreme religious enthusiasm and excitement, of which many illustrations might be given from other religions before and since the commencement of our era, as well as in the history of Christianity in early and recent times. Every one knows of the proceedings of the heathen oracles, the wild writhings and cries of the Pythoness and the mystic utterances of the Sibyl. In the Old Testament there is allusion to the ecstatic emotion of the prophets in the account of Saul, 1 Sam. xix. 24 (cf. Isaiah viii. 19, xxix. 4). The Montanists exhibited similar phenomena, and Tertullian has recorded several instances of such religious excitement, to which we have elsewhere referred. Chrysostom had to repress paroxysms of pious excitement closely resembling these in the fourth century;[3] and even down to our own times instances have never been wanting of this form of

[1] Matt. vi. 5 f.; Luke xi. 1 f.

[2] It is impossible to refer to every writer by whom the arguments adopted throughout this section may have been used or suggested, but we very gladly express obligation, especially to the writings of Baur, Zeller, Meyer, Reuss, Overbeck, Holtzmann, and Neander.

[3] *Hom. in Is.*, vi. 2.

hysterical religion. Into none of this can we enter here. Enough, we trust, has been said to show the true character of the supposed supernatural Charismata of Paul from his own account of them, and the information contained in his Epistles.

Although we have been forced to examine in considerable detail the passages in the writings of Paul cited by Apologists in support of miracles, the study is one of great value to our inquiry. These are the only passages which we possess in which a contemporary and eye-witness describes what he considers supernatural phenomena, and conveys to us his impression of miraculous agency. Instead of traditional reports of miracles narrated by writers who are unknown, and who did not actually see the occurrences in question, we have here a trustworthy witness dealing with matters in which he was personally interested, and writing a didactic homily upon the nature and operation of Charismata which he believed to be miraculous, and conferred upon the Church by the immediate agency of the Holy Spirit. The nineteenth century here comes into direct contact with the age of miracles, but at the touch these miracles vanish, and that which, seen through the golden mist of pious tradition, seems to possess unearthly power and beauty, on closer examination dwindles into the prose of every-day life. The more minutely miracles are scanned, the more unreal they are recognised to be. The point to which we now desire to call attention, however, is the belief and the mental constitution of Paul. We have seen something of the nature and operation of the gift of tongues. That the phenomena described proceeded from an ecstatic state, into which persons of highly excitable nervous organisation are very liable to fall under the operation of strong religious impressions, can scarcely be doubted. Eminent Apologists[1] have gravely illustrated the phenomena by the analogy of mesmerism, somnambulism, and the effects of magnetism. Paul asserts that he was subject to the influence, whatever it was, more than anyone, and there is nothing which is more credible than the statement, or more characteristic of the Apostle. We desire to speak of him with the profoundest respect and admiration. We know more, from his epistles, of the intimate life and feelings of the great Apostle of the Gentiles than of any other man of the apostolic age, and it is impossible not to feel warm sympathy with his noble and generous character. The history of Christianity, after the death of its Founder, would sink almost into commonplace if the grand figure of Paul were blotted from its pages. But it is no detraction to recognise that his nervous temperament rendered him peculiarly susceptible of those religious impressions which result in conditions of ecstatic trance,

[1] Bleek, Olshausen, and others.

to which, as we actually learn from himself, he was exceptionally subject. The effects of this temperament probably first made him a Christian; and to his enthusiastic imagination we owe most of the supernatural dogmas of the religion which he adopted and transformed.

One of these trances the Apostle himself recounts,[1] always with the cautious reserve, "whether in the body or out of the body I know not, God knoweth," how he was caught up to the third heaven, and in Paradise heard unutterable words which it is not lawful for a man to speak; in immediate connection with which he continues: "And lest I should be exalted above measure by the excess of the revelations, there was given to me a stake (σκόλοψ) in the flesh, an angel of Satan to buffet me."[2] This was one of the "visions (ὀπτασίας) and revelations (ἀποκαλύψεις) of the Lord" of which he speaks, and of which he had such an excess to boast. Can any one doubt that this was nearly akin to the state of ecstatic trance in which he spoke with tongues more than all the Corinthians? Does any one suppose that Paul, "whether in the body or out of the body," was ever actually caught up into "the third heaven," wherever that may be? or doubt that this was simply one of the pious hallucinations which visit those who are in such a state? If we are seriously to discuss the point—it is clear that evidence of such a thing is out of the question; that Paul himself admits that he cannot definitely describe what happened; that we have no other ground for considering the matter than the Apostle's own mysterious utterance; that it is impossible for a person subject to such visions and hallucinations to distinguish between reality and seeming; that this narrative has not only all the character of hallucination, but no feature of sober fact; and, finally, that, whilst it accords with all experiences of visionary hallucination, it contradicts all experience of practical life. We have seen that Paul believes in the genuineness and supernatural origin of the divine Charismata, and he in like manner believes in the reality of his visions and revelations. He has equal reason, or want of reason, in both cases.

What was the nature of the "stake in the flesh" which, upon the theory of the diabolical origin of disease, he calls "an angel of Satan to buffet me"? There have been many conjectures offered, but one explanation which has been advanced by able critics has special force and probability. It is suggested that this "stake in the flesh," which almost all now at least recognise to have been some physical malady, and very many

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 1 f.

[2] *Ib.*, xii. 7. We need not discuss the connection of καὶ τῇ ὑπερβολῇ. We have adopted that which is also the reading of the A.V.

suppose to have been headache or some other similar periodical and painful affection, was in reality a form of epilepsy.[1] It has been ably argued that the representation of the malady as "an angel of Satan" to buffet him, directly connects it with nervous disorders like epilepsy, which the Jews especially ascribed to diabolical influence; and the mention of this σκόλοψ in immediate continuation of his remarks on "visions" and "revelations," which a tendency to this very malady would so materially assist in producing, further confirms the conjecture.[2] No one can deny, and medical and psychological annals prove, that many men have been subject to visions and hallucinations which have never been seriously attributed to supernatural causes. There is not one single valid reason removing the ecstatic visions and trances of the Apostle Paul from this class.

We do not yet discuss the supposed vision in which he saw the risen Jesus, though it is no exception to the rest, but reserve it for the next chapter. At present, it suffices that we point out the bearing of our examination of Paul's general testimony to miracles upon our future consideration of his evidence for the Resurrection. If it be admitted that his judgment as to the miraculous character of the Charismata is fallacious, and that what he considered miraculous were simply natural phenomena, the theory of the reality of miracles becomes less tenable than ever. And if, further, it be recognised, as we think it necessarily must be, that Paul was subject to natural ecstatic trances, with all their accompanying forms of nervous excitement—"kinds of tongues," visions, and religious hallucinations—a strong and clear light will fall upon his further testimony for miraculous occurrences which we shall shortly have before us.

[1] Ewald, *Sendschr. des Ap. Paulus*, p. 307 f.; Hausrath, *Der Ap. Paulus*, p. 52 f.; Hofmann, *Die heil. Schr. N. T.*, 1866, ii. 3, p. 309; Holsten, *Zum Ev. des Paulus, u. s. w.*, p. 85 f.; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 186 f.; Strauss, *Das Leb. Jesu*, p. 302; Weber u. Holtzmann, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, ii., p. 542 f.

[2] Holsten, *Zum Ev. des Paulus u. des Petrus*, 1868, p. 85 f.

PART VI.

THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION

CHAPTER I.

THE RELATION OF EVIDENCE TO SUBJECT

When the evidence of the Gospels regarding the great central dogmas of ecclesiastical Christianity is shown to be untrustworthy and insufficient, Apologists appeal with confidence to the testimony of the Apostle Paul. We presume that it is not necessary to show that, in fact, the main weight of the case rests upon his Epistles, as undoubted documents of the apostolic age, written some thirty or forty years after the death of the Master. The retort has frequently been made to the earlier portion of this work that, so long as the evidence of Paul remains unshaken, the apologetic position is secure. We may quote a few lines from an able work, part of a passage discussed in the preceding chapter, as a statement of the case: "In the first place, merely as a matter of historical attestation, the Gospels are not the strongest evidence for the Christian miracles. Only one of the four, in its present shape, is claimed as the work of an Apostle, and of that the genuineness is disputed. The Acts of the Apostles stand upon very much the same footing with the synoptic Gospels, and of this book we are promised a further examination. But we possess at least some undoubted writings of one who was himself a chief actor in the events which followed immediately upon those recorded in the Gospels; and in these undoubted writings St. Paul certainly shows by incidental allusions, the good faith of which cannot be questioned, that he believed himself to be endowed with the power of working miracles, and that miracles, or what were thought to be such, were actually wrought by him and by his contemporaries.....Besides these allusions, St. Paul repeatedly refers to the cardinal miracles of the Resurrection and Ascension; he refers to them as notorious and unquestionable facts at a time when such an assertion might have been easily refuted. On one occasion he gives a very circumstantial account

of the testimony on which the belief in the Resurrection rested (1 Cor. xv. 4 8). And not only does he assert the Resurrection as a fact, but he builds upon it a whole scheme of doctrine: 'If Christ be not risen,' he says, 'then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain.' We do not stay now to consider the exact philosophical weight of this evidence. It will be time enough to do this when it has received the critical discussion that may be presumed to be in store for it. But as external evidence, in the legal sense, it is probably the best that can be produced, and it has been entirely untouched so far."[1] We have already disposed of the "allusions" above referred to. We shall in due time deal with the rest of the statements in this passage, but at present it is sufficient to agree at least with the remark that, "as external evidence," the testimony of Paul "is probably the best that can be produced." We know at least who the witness really is, which is an advantage denied us in the case of the Gospels. It would be premature to express surprise that we find the case of miracles, and more especially of such stupendous miracles as the Resurrection and Ascension, practically resting upon the testimony of a single witness. This thought will intrude itself, but cannot at present be pursued.

The allegation which we have to examine is that the Founder of Christianity, after being dead and buried, rose from the dead and did not again die, but, after remaining some time with his disciples, ascended with his body into heaven.[2] It is unnecessary to complicate the question by adding the other doctrines regarding the miraculous birth and divine origin and personality of Jesus. In the problem before us certain objective facts are asserted which admit of being judicially tested. We have nothing to do here with the vague modern representation of these events, by means of which the objective facts vanish, and are replaced by subjective impressions and tricks of consciousness or symbols of spiritual life. Those who adopt such views have, of course, abandoned all that is real and supernatural in the supposed events. The Resurrection and Ascension with which we have to deal are events precisely as objective and real as the death and burial—no ideal process figured by the imagination or embodiments of Christian hope, but tangible realities, historical occurrences in the sense of

[1] Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, 1876, p. 10 f.

[2] In the Articles of the Church of England this is expressed as follows: Art. ii. "who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, etc." Art. iii. "As Christ died for us, and was buried; so also it is to be believed that He went down into Hell." Art. iv. "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His Body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended unto Heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day."

ordinary life. If Jesus, after being crucified, dead, and buried, did not physically rise again from the dead, and in the flesh,[1] without again dying, "ascend into Heaven," the whole case falls to the ground. These incidents, although stupendous miracles, must have been actual occurrences. If they did not take place, our task is at an end. If it be asserted that they really did take place, their occurrence must be attested by adequate evidence. Apologists, whilst protesting that the occurrences in question are believed upon ordinary historical evidence, and that Christianity requires no indulgence, but submits itself to the same tests as any other affirmation, do not practically act upon this principle, but, as soon as it is enunciated, introduce a variety of special pleas which remove the case from the domain of history into that of theology, and proceed upon one assumption after another, until the fundamental facts become enveloped and, so to say, protected from judicial criticism by a cloud of religious dogmas and hypotheses.[2] By confining our attention to the simple facts which form the basis of the whole superstructure of ecclesiastical Christianity, we may avoid much confusion of ideas, and restrict the field of inquiry to reasonable limits. We propose, therefore, to limit our investigation to the evidence for the reality of the Resurrection and Ascension.

What evidence could be regarded as sufficient to establish the reality of such supposed occurrences? The question is one which demands the serious attention and consideration of every thoughtful man. It is obvious that the amount of evidence requisite to satisfy our minds as to the truth of any statement should be measured by the nature of that statement and, we may as well add, by its practical importance to ourselves. The news that a man was married or a child born last week is received without doubt, because men are married and children are born every day; and, although such pieces of gossip are frequently untrue, nothing appears more natural or more in accordance with our experience. If we take more distant and less familiar events, we have no doubt that a certain monarch was crowned, and that he subsequently died some centuries ago. If we ask for proof of the statement, nothing may be forthcoming of a very minute

[1] The disappearance of the body from the sepulchre, a point much insisted upon, could have had no significance or reality if the body did not rise and afterwards ascend.

[2] A work of this kind may be mentioned in illustration: Dr. Westcott's *Gospel of the Resurrection*. The argument of this work is of unquestionable ability, but it is chiefly remarkable, we think, for the manner in which the direct evidence is hurried over, and a mass of assertions and assumptions, the greater part of which is utterly untenable and inadmissible, is woven into specious and eloquent pleading, and does duty for substantial testimony.

or indubitable nature. No absolute eye-witness of the coronation may have left a clear and detailed narrative of the ceremony; and possibly there may no longer be extant a sufficiently attested document proving with certainty the death of the monarch. There are several considerations, however, which make us perfectly satisfied with the evidence incomplete as it may be. Monarchs are generally crowned and invariably die; and the statement that any one particular monarch was crowned and died is so completely in conformity with experience that we have no hesitation in believing it in the specific case. We are satisfied to believe such ordinary statements upon very slight evidence, both because our experience prepares us to believe that they are true and because we do not much care whether they are true or not. If life, or even succession to an estate, depended upon either event, the demand for evidence, even in such simple matters, would be immensely intensified. The converse of the statement would not meet with the same reception. Would anyone believe the affirmation that Alfred the Great, for instance, did not die at all? What amount of evidence would be required before such a statement could be pronounced sufficiently attested? Universal experience would be so uniformly opposed to the assertion that such a phenomenon had taken place, that probably no evidence readily conceivable could ensure the belief of more than a credulous few. The assertion that a man actually died and was buried, and yet afterwards rose from the dead, is still more at variance with human experience. The prolongation of life to long periods is comparatively consistent with experience; and if a life extending to several centuries be incredible, it is only so in degree, and is not absolutely contrary to the order of nature, which certainly under present conditions does not favour the supposition of such lengthened existence, but still does not fix hard-and-fast limits to the life of man. The resurrection of a man who has once been absolutely dead, however, is contrary to all human experience. If to this we add the assertion that the person so raised from the dead never again died, but, after continuing some time longer on earth, ascended bodily to some invisible and inconceivable place called Heaven, there to "sit at the right hand of God," the shock to reason and common-sense becomes so extreme that it is difficult even to realise the nature of the affirmation. It would be hopeless to endeavour to define the evidence which could establish the reality of the alleged occurrences.

As the central doctrines of a religion upon which the salvation of the human race is said to depend, we are too deeply interested to be satisfied with slight evidence or no evidence at all. It has not unfrequently been made a reproach that forensic evidence is

required of the reality of Divine Revelation. Such a course is regarded as perfectly preposterous, whether the test be applied to the primary assertion that a revelation has been made at all, or to its contents. What kind of evidence, then, are we permitted decorously to require upon so momentous a subject? Apparently, just so much as Apologists can conveniently set before us, and no more. The evidence deemed necessary for the settlement of a Scotch peerage case, or a disputed will, is, we do not hesitate to say, infinitely more complete than that which it is thought either pious or right to expect in the case of religion. The actual occurrence of the Resurrection and Ascension is certainly a matter of evidence, and it is scarcely decent that any man should be required to believe what is so opposed to human experience, upon more imperfect evidence than is required for the transfer of land or the right to a title, simply because ecclesiastical dogmas are founded upon them, and it is represented that, unless they be true, "our hope is vain." The testimony requisite to establish the reality of such stupendous miracles can scarcely be realised. Proportionately, it should be as unparalleled in its force as those events are in fact. Evidence of the actual death of the person requires to be as complete as evidence of his resurrection. One point, moreover, must never be forgotten. Human testimony is exceedingly fallible at its best. It is liable to error from innumerable causes, and most of all, probably, when religious excitement is present, and disturbing elements of sorrow, fear, doubt, or enthusiasm interfere with the calmness of judgment. When any assertion is made which contradicts unvarying experience, upon evidence which experience knows to be universally liable to error, there cannot be much hesitation in disbelieving the assertion and preferring belief in the order of nature. And when evidence proceeds from an age exceptionally exposed to error, from ignorance of natural laws, and the prevalence of superstition, and religious excitement, it cannot be received without the gravest suspicion. We make these brief remarks, in anticipation, as nothing is more essential in the discussion upon which we are about to enter than a proper appreciation of the allegations which are to be tested, and of the nature of the testimony required for belief in them.

We shall not limit our inquiry to the testimony of Paul, but shall review the whole of the evidence adduced for the Resurrection and Ascension. Hitherto, our examination of the historical books of the New Testament has been mainly for the purpose of ascertaining their character, and the value of their evidence for miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation. It is unnecessary for us here minutely to recapitulate the results. The Acts of the Apostles, we have shown, cannot be received as testimony of the

slightest weight upon any of the points before us Briefly to state the case of the Gospels in other words than our own, we repeat the honest statement of the able writer quoted at the beginning of this chapter: "In the first place, merely as a matter of historical attestation, the Gospels are not the strongest evidence for the Christian miracles. Only one of the four, in its present shape, is claimed as the work of an Apostle, and of that the genuineness is disputed."[1] We may add that the third Synoptic does not, in the estimation of any one who has examined the Acts of the Apostles, gain additional credibility by being composed by the same author as the latter work. The writers of the four Gospels are absolutely unknown to us, and in the case of three of them it is not even affirmed that they were eye-witnesses of the Resurrection and Ascension and other miracles narrated. The undeniably doubtful authorship of the fourth Gospel, not to make a more positive statement here, renders this work, which was not written until upwards of half a century, at the very least, after the death of Jesus, incapable of proving anything in regard to the Resurrection and Ascension. A much stronger statement might be made, but we refer readers to our preceding arguments, and we shall learn something more of the character of the Gospel narratives as we proceed.

Although we cannot attach any value to the Gospels as evidence, we propose, before taking the testimony of Paul, to survey the various statements made by them regarding the astounding miracles we are discussing. Enough has been said to show that we cannot accept any statement as true simply because it is made by a Gospel or Gospels. When it is related in the first Synoptic, for instance, that Pilate took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, "I am innocent of this man's blood: see ye to it"[2]—an incident to which no reference, be it said in passing, is made by the other Evangelists, although it is sufficiently remarkable to have deserved notice—we cannot of course assume that Pilate actually said or did anything of the kind. A comparison of the various accounts of the Resurrection and Ascension, however, and careful examination of their details, will be of very great use, by enabling us to appreciate the position of the case apart from the evidence of Paul. The indefinite impression fostered by Apologists, that the evidence of the Gospels supplements and completes the evidence of the Apostle, and forms an aggregate body of testimony of remarkable force and volume, must be examined, and a clear conception formed of the whole case.

One point may at once be mentioned before we enter upon our examination of the Gospels. The Evangelists narrate such

[1] Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 10. [2] Matt. xxvii. 24.

astonishing occurrences as the Resurrection and Ascension with perfect composure and absence of surprise. This characteristic is even made an argument for the truth of their narrative. The impression made upon our minds, however, is the very reverse of that which Apologists desire us to receive. The writers do not in the least degree seem to have realised the exceptional character of the occurrences they relate, and betray the assurance of persons writing in an ignorant and superstitious age, whose minds have become too familiar with the supernatural to be at all surprised either by a resurrection from the dead or a bodily ascension. Miracles in their eyes have lost their strangeness and seem quite commonplace. It will be seen, as we examine the narratives, that a stupendous miracle, or a convulsion of nature, is thrown in by one or omitted by another as a mere matter of detail. An earthquake and the resurrection of many bodies of saints are mere trifles which can be inserted without wonder, or omitted without regret. The casual and momentary expression of hesitation to believe, which is introduced, is evidently nothing more than a rhetorical device to heighten the reality of the scene. It would have been infinitely more satisfactory had we been able to perceive that these witnesses, instead of being genuine denizens of the age of miracles, had really understood the astounding nature of the occurrences they report, and did not consider a miracle the most natural thing in the world.

CHAPTER II.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE GOSPELS

In order more fully to appreciate the nature of the narratives which the four Evangelists give of the last hours of the life of Jesus, we may take them up at the point where, mocked and buffeted by the Roman soldiers, he is finally led away to be crucified.[1]

According to the Synoptics, the Roman guard entrusted with the duty of executing the cruel sentence find a man of Cyrene, Simon by name, and compel him to carry the cross.[2] It was customary for those condemned to crucifixion to carry the cross, or at least the main portion of it, themselves to the place of execution, and no explanation is given by the Synoptists for the deviation from this practice which they relate. The fourth Gospel, however, does not appear to know anything of this incident, or of Simon of Cyrene, but distinctly states that Jesus bore his own cross.[3] On the way to Golgotha, according to the third Gospel, Jesus is followed by a great multitude of the people, and of women who were bewailing and lamenting him, and he addresses to them a few prophetic sentences.[4] We might be surprised at the singular fact

[1] Let no one suppose that, in freely criticising the Gospels, we regard without emotion the actual incidents which lie at the bottom of these narratives, supposing them to be genuine. No one can, without pain, form to himself any adequate conception of the terrible sufferings of the Master, maltreated and insulted by a base and brutal multitude, too degraded to understand his noble character, and too ignorant to appreciate his elevated teaching; and to follow his course from the tribunal which sacrificed him to Jewish popular clamour to the spot where he ended a brief but self-sacrificing life by the shameful death of a slave may well make sympathy take the place of criticism. Profound veneration for the great Teacher, however, and earnest interest in all that concerns his history, rather command serious and unhesitating examination of the statements made with regard to him, than discourage an attempt to ascertain the truth; and it would be anything but respect for his memory to accept without question the Gospel accounts of his life simply because they were composed with the desire to glorify him.

[2] Matt. xxvii. 32; Mark xv. 21; Luke xxiii. 26.

[3] *βαστάζων ἑαυτῷ τὸν σταυρόν*, John xix. 17. If, instead of this reading, which is that of the Sinaitic and Alexandrian codices and other authorities, adopted by Tischendorf and others, the *τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ* of the received text and Lachmann, or *αὐτῷ τ. στ.*, of B, X, etc., be preferred, the result is the same. We may mention, in passing, that the fourth Gospel has no reference to a saying ascribed by the Synoptics to Jesus, in which bearing his cross is used typically: Matt. x. 38, xvi. 24; Mark viii. 34, x. 21; Luke ix. 23, xiv. 27.

[4] Luke xxiii. 27 f.; cf. xxi. 23; Matt. xxiv. 19.

that there is no reference to this incident in any other Gospel, and that words of Jesus, so weighty in themselves and spoken at so supreme a moment, should not elsewhere have been recorded, but for the fact that, from internal evidence, the address must be assigned to a period subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem. The other Evangelists may, therefore, well ignore it.

It was the custom to give those about to be crucified a draught of wine containing a strong opiate, which in some degree alleviated the intense suffering of that mode of death. Mark[1] probably refers to this (xv. 23) when he states that, on reaching the place of execution, "they gave him wine (*οἶνον*) mingled with myrrh." The fourth Gospel has nothing of this. Matthew says (xxvii. 34): "They gave him vinegar (*ὄξος*) to drink mingled with gall"[2] (*μετὰ χολῆς*). Even if, instead of *ὄξος* with the Alexandrian and a majority of MSS., we read *οἶνος*, "wine," with the Sinaitic, Vatican, and some other ancient codices, this is a curious statement, and is well worthy of a moment's notice as suggestive of the way in which these narratives were written. The conception of a suffering Messiah, it is well known, was more particularly supported, by New Testament writers, by attributing a Messianic character to Psalm xxii., lxix., and Isaiah liii., and throughout the narrative of the Passion we are perpetually referred to these and other Scriptures, as finding their fulfilment in the sufferings of Jesus. The first Synoptist found in Psalm lxix. 21 (Sept. lxviii. 21): "They gave me also gall (*χολήν*) for my food, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar (*ὄξος*) to drink"; and apparently, in order to make the supposed fulfilment correspond as closely as possible, he combined the "gall" of the food with the vinegar or wine in strangely literal fashion,[3] very characteristic, however, of the whole of the Evangelists. Luke, who seems not to have understood the custom known perhaps to Mark, represents (xxiii. 36) the soldiers as mocking Jesus by "offering him vinegar"[4] (*ὄξος*); he omits the gall, but probably refers to the same Psalm without being so falsely literal as Matthew.

[1] We shall, for the sake of brevity, call the Gospels by the names assigned to them in the Canon.

[2] There have been many attempts to explain away *χολή*, and to make it mean either a species of Vermuth, or any bitter substance (Olshausen, *Leidensgesch.*, 168); but the great mass of critics rightly retain its meaning—"gall." So Ewald, Meyer, Bleek, Strauss, Weisse, Schenkel, Volkmar, Alford, Wordsworth, etc.

[3] "St. Matthew mentally refers it to Psalm lxix. 21 *ὄξος* (or *possibly οἶνον*, which Tischendorf admits from ℵ, B, D, K, L, etc.) *μετὰ χολῆς*" (Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ii., p. 400, note 1).

[4] Luke omits the subsequent offer of "vinegar" (probably the *Posca* of the Roman soldiers) mentioned by the other Evangelists. We presume the reference in xxiii. 36 to be the same as the act described in Matt. xxvii. 34 and Mark xv. 23.

We need not enter into the discussion as to the chronology of the Passion week, regarding which there is so much discrepancy in the accounts of the fourth Gospel and of the Synoptics, nor shall we pause minutely to deal with the irreconcilable difference which, it is admitted, exists in their statement of the hours at which the events of the last fatal day occurred. The fourth Gospel (xix. 4) represents Pilate as bringing Jesus forth to the Jews "about the sixth hour" (noon). Mark (xv. 25), in obvious agreement with the other Synoptics as further statements prove, distinctly says: "And it was the third hour (9 o'clock a.m.), and they crucified him." At the sixth hour (noon), according to the three Synoptists, there was darkness over the earth till about the ninth hour (3 o'clock p.m.), shortly after which time Jesus expired.[1] As, according to the fourth Gospel, the sentence was not even passed before midday, and some time must be allowed for preparation and going to the place of execution, it is clear that there is a very wide discrepancy between the hours at which Jesus was crucified and died, unless, as regards the latter point, we take agreement in all as to the hour of death. In this case, commencing at the hour of the fourth Gospel and ending with that of the Synoptics, Jesus must have expired after being less than three hours on the cross. According to the Synoptics, and also, if we assign a later hour for the death, according to the fourth Gospel, he cannot have been more than six hours on the cross. We shall presently see that this remarkably rapid death has an important bearing upon the history and the views formed regarding it. It is known that crucifixion, besides being the most shameful mode of death, and indeed chiefly reserved for slaves and the lowest criminals, was one of the most lingering and atrociously cruel punishments ever invented by the malignity of man. Persons crucified, it is stated and admitted, generally lived for at least twelve hours, and sometimes even survived the excruciating tortures of the cross for three days. We shall not further anticipate remarks which must hereafter be made regarding this.

We need not do more than again point out that no two of the Gospels agree upon so simple, yet important, a point as the inscription on the cross.[2] It is argued that "a close examination of the narratives furnishes no sufficient reason for supposing that all proposed to give the same or the entire inscription," and, after some curious reasoning, it is concluded that "there is at least no possibility of showing any inconsistency on the strictly literal interpretation of the words of the evangelist."[3] On the contrary,

[1] Matt. xxvii. 45 f.; Mark xv. 33 f.; Luke xxiii. 44 f.
[2] Cf. Matt. xxvii. 37; Mark xv. 26; Luke xxiii. 38; John xix. 19.
[3] Westcott, *Int. to Study of the Gospels*, 4th ed., p. 328, note 10.

we had ventured to suppose that, in giving a form of words said to have been affixed to the cross, the evangelists intended to give the form actually used, and consequently "the same" and "entire inscription," which must have been short; and we consider it quite inconceivable that such was not their deliberate intention, however imperfectly fulfilled.

We pass on merely to notice a curious point in connection with an incident related by all the Gospels. It is stated that the Roman soldiers who crucified Jesus divided his garments amongst them, casting lots to determine what part each should take. The clothing of criminals executed was the perquisite of the soldiers who performed the duty, and there is nothing improbable in the story that the four soldiers decided by lot the partition of the garments—indeed, there is every reason to suppose that such was the practice. The incident is mentioned as the direct fulfilment of the Psalm xxii. 18, which is quoted literally from the Septuagint version (xxi. 18) by the author of the fourth Gospel. He did not, however, understand the passage, or disregarded its true meaning, and in order to make the incident accord better, as he supposed, with the prophetic Psalm, he represents that the soldiers amicably parted the rest of his garments amongst them without lot, but cast lots for the coat, which was without seam: (xix. 24) "They said, therefore, among themselves: Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be; that the Scripture might be fulfilled: They parted my garments among them, and for my vesture they cast lots. These things, therefore, the soldiers did." The Evangelist does not perceive that the two parts of the sentence in the Psalm really refer to the same action, but exhibits the partition of the garments and the lots for the vesture as separately fulfilled. The Synoptists apparently divide the whole by lot.[1] They do not expressly refer to the Psalm, except in the received text of Matthew xxvii. 35, into which and some other MSS. the quotation has been interpolated.[2] That the narrative of the Gospels, instead of being independent and genuine history, is constructed upon the lines of supposed Messianic Psalms and passages of the Old Testament will become increasingly evident as we proceed.

It is stated by all the Gospels that two malefactors—the first and second calling them "robbers"—were crucified with Jesus, the one on the right hand and the other on the left. The statement in Mark xv. 28, that this fulfilled Isaiah liii. 12, which is found in our received text, is omitted by all the oldest codices,

[1] Matt. xxvii. 35; Mark xv. 24; Luke xxiii. 34.

[2] "Certainly an interpolation" (Westcott, *Int. to Study of Gospels*, p. 325, note 2).

and is an interpolation ;[1] but we shall hereafter have to speak of this point in connection with another matter, and we now merely point out that, though the verse was thus inserted here, it is placed in the mouth of Jesus himself by the third Synoptist (xxii. 37), and the whole passage from which it was taken has evidently largely influenced the composition of the narrative before us. According to the first and second Gospels,[2] the robbers joined with the chief priests and the scribes and elders and those who passed by in mocking and reviling Jesus. This is directly contradicted by the third Synoptist, who states that only one of the malefactors did so (xxiii. 39 f.): "But the other answering rebuked him and said: Dost thou not even fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we are receiving the due reward of our deeds; but this man did nothing amiss. And he said: Jesus, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom. And he said unto him: Verily, I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." It requires very little examination to detect that this story is legendary, and cannot be maintained as historical. Those who dwell upon its symbolical character do nothing to establish its veracity. This exemplary robber speaks like an Apostle, and in praying Jesus as the Messiah to remember him when he came into his kingdom, he shows much more than apostolic appreciation of the claims and character of Jesus. The reply of Jesus, moreover, contains a statement not only wholly contradictory of Jewish belief as to the place of departed spirits, but of all Christian doctrine at the time as to the descent of Jesus into Hades. Into this, however, it is needless for us to go.[3] Not only do the other Gospels show no knowledge of so interesting an episode, but, as we have pointed out, the first and second Synoptics positively exclude it. We shall see, moreover, that there is a serious difficulty in understanding how this conversation on the cross, which is so exclusively the property of the third Synoptist, could have been reported to him.

The Synoptics represent the passers-by and the chief priests, scribes, and elders as mocking Jesus as he hung on the cross. The fourth Gospel preserves total silence as to all this. It is curious also that the mocking is based upon that described in the Psalm xxii., to which we have already several times had to refer. In verse 7 f. we have: "All they that see me laughed me to scorn; they shot out the lip; they shook the head (saying), 8. He trusted

[1] "Certainly an interpolation" (Westcott, *ib.*, p. 326, note 5).

[2] Matt. xxvii. 44; Mark xv. 32.

[3] It is unnecessary for us to discuss the various ideas of which this episode is supposed to be symbolical.

in the Lord, let Him deliver him, let Him save him (seeing) that he delighteth in him."[1] Compare with this Matt. xxvii. 39 f., Mark xv. 29 f., Luke xxiii. 35. Is it possible to suppose that the chief priests and elders and scribes could actually have quoted the words of this Psalm, there put into the mouth of the Psalmist's enemies, as the first Synoptist represents (xxvii. 43)? It is obvious that the speeches ascribed to the chief priests and elders can be nothing more than the expressions which the writers considered suitable to them, and the fact that they seek their inspiration in a Psalm which they suppose to be Messianic is suggestive.

We have already mentioned that the fourth Gospel says nothing of any mocking speeches. The author, however, narrates an episode (xix. 25–27) in which the dying Jesus is represented as confiding his mother to the care of "the disciple whom he loved," of which, in their turn, the Synoptists seem to be perfectly ignorant. We have already elsewhere remarked that there is no evidence that there was any disciple whom Jesus specially loved, except the repeated statement in this Gospel. No other work of the New Testament contains a hint of such an individual, and much less that he was the Apostle John. Nor is there any evidence that any one of the disciples took the mother of Jesus to his own home. There is, therefore, no external confirmation of this episode; but there is, on the contrary, much which leads to the conclusion that it is not historical. There has been some discussion as to whether four women are mentioned (xix. 25), or whether "his mother's sister" is represented as "Mary, the wife of Clopas," or was a different person. There are, we think, reasons for concluding that there were four; but, in the doubt, we shall not base any argument on the point. The Synoptics[2] distinctly state that "the women that followed him from Galilee," amongst whom were "Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Joseph and the mother of Zebedee's sons,"[3] and, as the third Synoptic says, "all his acquaintance,"[4] were standing "afar off" (*μακρόθεν*). They are unanimous in saying this, and there is every reason for supposing that they are correct.[5] This is, consequently, a contradiction of the account in the fourth Gospel that John and the women were standing "by the cross of Jesus." Olshausen, Lücke, and others, suggest that they subsequently came from a distance up to the cross; but the statement of the Synoptists is made at the close, and after this scene is supposed to have taken

[1] 7. Πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντές με ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με, ἐλάλησαν ἐν χείλεσιν, ἐκίνησαν κεφαλήν, 8. Ἤλπισεν ἐπὶ Κύριον, ῥυσάσθω αὐτὸν, σωσάτω αὐτὸν, ὅτι θέλει αὐτὸν. Ps. xxi., Sept.; cf. verses 4, 5.

[2] Matt. xxvii. 55 f.; Mark xv. 40; Luke xxiii. 49.

[3] Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40.

[4] Luke xxiii. 49.

[5] Cf. Matt. xxvi. 31, 56; Mark xiv. 27.

place. The opposite conjecture, that from standing close to the cross they removed to a distance, has little to recommend it. Both explanations are equally arbitrary and unsupported by evidence.

It may be well, in connection with this, to refer to the various sayings and cries ascribed by the different Evangelists to Jesus on the cross. We have already mentioned the conversation with the "penitent thief," which is peculiar to the third Gospel, and now that with the "beloved disciple," which is only in the fourth. The third Synoptic[1] states that, on being crucified, Jesus said, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do"—a saying which is in the spirit of Jesus and worthy of him, but of which the other Gospels do not take any notice.[2] The fourth Gospel again has a cry (xix. 28): "After this, Jesus, knowing that all things are now fulfilled, that the Scripture might be accomplished, saith: I thirst." The majority of critics understand by this that "I thirst" is said in order "that the Scripture might be fulfilled" by the offer of the vinegar, related in the following verse. The Scripture referred to is of course Psalm lxix. 21: "They gave me also gall for my food, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar (ὄξος) to drink"; which we have already quoted in connection with Matthew xxvii. 34. The third Synoptic (xxiii. 36) represents the vinegar as being offered in mockery at a much earlier period, and Matthew and Mark[3] connect the offer of the vinegar with quite a different cry from that in the fourth Gospel. Nothing could be more natural than that, after protracted agony, the patient sufferer should cry, "I thirst"; but the dogmatic purpose, which dictates the whole narrative in the fourth Gospel, is rendered obvious by the reference of such a cry to a supposed Messianic prophecy. This is further displayed by the statement (v. 29) that the sponge with vinegar was put "upon hyssop" (ὑσσώπῳ) the two Synoptics have "on a reed" (καλάμῳ)—which the author probably uses in association with the paschal lamb,[4] an idea present to his mind throughout the passion. The first and second Synoptics[5] represent the last cry of Jesus to have been a quotation from Psalm xxii. 1: "Eli (or Mark, Eloi), Eli, lema sabacthani? that is to say: My God, my God, why didst thou forsake me?" This, according to them, evidently, was the last articulate utterance of the expiring Master, for they merely add that "when he cried again with a loud voice" Jesus yielded up his spirit.[6] Neither of the other Gospels has any

[1] xxiii. 34.

[2] Strauss calls attention to Isaiah liii. 12, where, of the servant of Jehovah, it is said that he "made intercession for the transgressors" (*Das Leben Jesu*, p. 584).

[3] Matt. xxvii. 48 f.; Mark xv. 36.

[4] Exod. xii. 22; cf. Levit. xiv. 4, 6, 49.

[5] Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34.

[6] Matt. xxvii. 50; Mark xv. 37.

mention of this cry. The third Gospel substitutes: "And when Jesus cried with a loud voice he said: Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit, and having said this he expired."[1] This is an almost literal quotation from the Septuagint version of Psalm xxxi. 5. The fourth Gospel has a totally different cry (xix. 30), for, on receiving the vinegar, which accomplished the Scripture, he represents Jesus as saying, "It is finished" (Τετέλεσται), and immediately expiring.

It will be observed that seven sayings are attributed to Jesus on the cross, of which the first two Gospels have only one, the third Synoptic three, and the fourth Gospel three. We do not intend to express any opinion here in favour of any of these, but we merely point out the remarkable fact that, with the exception of the one cry in the first two Synoptics, each Gospel has ascribed different sayings to the dying Master, and not only no two of them agree, but in some important instances the statement of the one Evangelist seems to exclude the accounts of the others. Everyone knows the hackneyed explanation of Apologists, but in works which repeat each other so much elsewhere it certainly is a curious phenomenon that there is so little agreement here. If all the Master's disciples "forsook him and fled,"[2] and his few friends and acquaintances stood "afar off" regarding his sufferings, it is readily conceivable that pious tradition had unlimited play. We must return to the cry recorded in Matthew and Mark,[3] the only one about which two witnesses agree. Both of them give this quotation from Psalm xxii. 1 in Aramaic: Eli (Mark: Eloi), Eli,[4] lema sabacthani. The purpose is clearly to enable the reader to understand what follows, which we quote from the first Gospel: "And some of them that stood there, when they heard it said: This man calleth for Elijah..... The rest said: Let be, let us see whether Elijah cometh to save him."[5] It is impossible to confuse "*Eli*" or "*Eloi*" with "*Elijahu*," and the explanations suggested by Apologists are not sufficient to remove a difficulty which seems to betray the legendary character of the statement. The mistake of supposing that Jesus called for Elijah could not possibly have been made by those who spoke Aramaic; that strangers not perfectly understanding Aramaic should be here intended cannot be maintained, for the suggestion is represented as adopted by "the rest." The Roman soldiers had probably never heard of Elijah; and there is nothing to support the allegation of mockery

[1] Luke xxiii. 46. [2] Matt. xxvi. 56. [3] Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34.

[4] The Sinaitic cod., Matt. xxvii. 46 reads: ἐλωΐ, ἐλωΐ, λεμὰ σαβαχθανεί; the cod. Alex., ἠλί, ἠλί, κ. τ. λ.; cod. Vat., ἐλωεί, ἐλωεί, κ. τ. λ. D has ἠλεί, ἠλεί, κ.τ.λ. We only note the variations in the first two words, which are those upon which the question turns.

[5] Matt. xxvii. 47, 49; cf. Mark xv. 35, 36.

as accounting for the singular episode. The verse of the Psalm was too well known to the Jews to admit of any suggested play upon words.

The three Synoptics state that, from the sixth hour (mid-day) to the ninth (3 o'clock), "there was darkness over all the earth" (*σκότος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν*).[1] The third Gospel adds, "the sun having failed" (*τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος*).[2] By the term "all the earth" some critics maintain that the Evangelist merely meant the Holy Land,[3] whilst others hold that he uses the expression in its literal sense. The fourth Gospel takes no notice of this darkness. Such a phenomenon is not a trifle to be ignored in any account of the crucifixion, if it actually occurred. The omission of all mention of it either amounts to a denial of its occurrence, or betrays most suspicious familiarity with supernatural interference. Many efforts have been made to explain this darkness naturally, or at least to find some allusion to it in contemporary history, all of which have signally failed. As the moon was at the full, it is admitted that the darkness could not have been an eclipse. The Fathers appealed to Phlegon the Chronicler, who mentions[4] an eclipse of the sun about this period accompanied by an earthquake, and also to a similar occurrence referred to by Eusebius,[5] probably quoted from the historian Thallus; but, of course, modern knowledge has dispelled the illusion that these phenomena have any connection with the darkness we are discussing, and the theory that the Evangelists are confirmed in their account by this evidence is now generally abandoned. It is apart from our object to show how common it was amongst classical and other writers to represent nature as sympathising with national or social disasters;[6] and as a poetical touch this remarkable darkness of the Synoptists, of which no one else knows anything, is quite intelligible. The statement, however, is as seriously and deliberately made as any other in their narrative, and does not add to its credibility. It is obvious that the account is mythical, and it bears a strange likeness to passages in the Old Testament, from the imagery of which the representation in all probability was derived.[7]

[1] Matt. xxvii. 45; Mark xv. 33; Luke xxiii. 44.

[2] Luke xxiii. 45. This is the reading of the Sinaitic and Vatican (*ἐκλείπ.*) codices. A reads *καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος.*

[3] Dr. Farrar says: "It is quite possible that the darkness was a local gloom which hung densely over the guilty city and its immediate neighbourhood" (*Life of Christ*, 5th ed., ii., p. 414).

[4] xiii. *Olympiad.* [5] *Chron. ad Olymp.*, 202.

[6] Cf. Virgil., *Georg.*, i. 463-468; Dio Cass., 40.17, 56.29; Plin. *H. N.*, 2.30; Plutarch., *V. Rom.*, § 27, p. 34; *Cæs.*, § 69, p. 740 f.; Wetstein, Grotius, *ad h. l.*

[7] Cf. Joel ii. 10, 31, iii. 15; Amos viii. 9; Isaiah xiii. 10, *l.* 3, etc.

The first and second Gospels state that when Jesus cried with a loud voice and yielded up his spirit "the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom."[1] The third Synoptic associates this occurrence with the eclipse of the sun, and narrates it before the final cry and death of the Master.[2] The fourth Gospel takes no notice of so extraordinary a phenomenon. The question might be asked: How could the chief priests, who do not appear to have been at all convinced by such a miracle, but still continued their invincible animosity against the Christian sect, reveal the occurrence of such a wonder, of which there is no mention elsewhere? Here again the account is legendary and symbolical, and in the spirit of the age of miracles.[3]

The first Synoptist, however, has further marvels to relate. He states in continuation of the passage quoted above: "and the earth was shaken (ἐσείσθη) and the rocks were rent and the sepulchres were opened, and many bodies of the saints who slept were raised; and they came out of the sepulchres after his resurrection, and entered into the holy city and appeared unto many."[4] How great must be the amazement of anyone who may have been inclined to suppose the Gospels sober historical works, on finding that the other three Evangelists do not even mention these astounding occurrences related by the first Synoptist! An earthquake (σεισμός)[5] and the still more astounding resurrection of many saints who appeared unto "many," and, therefore, an event by no means secret and unknown to all but the Synoptist, and yet three other writers, who give accounts of the crucifixion and death of Jesus, and who enter throughout into very minute details, do not even condescend to mention them! Nor does any other New Testament writer chronicle them. It is unnecessary to say that the passage has been a very serious difficulty for Apologists; and one of the latest writers of this school, reproducing the theories of earlier critics, deals with it in a Life of Christ, which "is avowedly and unconditionally the work of a believer,"[6] as follows: "An earthquake shook the earth and split the rocks, and as it rolled away from their places the great stones which closed and covered the cavern sepulchres of the Jews, it seemed to the imaginations of many to have disimprisoned the spirits of the dead, and to have filled the air with ghostly visitants, who after Christ had risen appeared to linger in the Holy City." In a note he adds: "Only in some such way as this can I account for the singular and

[1] Matt. xxvii. 51; Mark xv. 38. [2] Luke xxiii. 45.

[3] We have elsewhere referred to the wonderful occurrences related by Josephus at the Temple about the time of the siege (*Bell. Jud.*, vi. 5, § 3; cf. Apoc., xi. 19).

[4] Matt. xxvii. 51–53. [5] So the phenomenon is distinctly called in v. 54.

[6] Farrar, *Life of Christ*, i., Pref., p. viii.

wholly isolated allusion of Matt. xxvii. 52, 53."[1] It is worthy of note, and we may hereafter refer to the point, that learned divines thus do not scruple to adopt the "vision hypothesis" of the resurrection. Even if the resurrection of the saints so seriously related by the Evangelist be thus disposed of, and it be assumed that the other Gospels, likewise adopting the "vision" explanation, consequently declined to give an objective place in their narrative to what they believed to be a purely subjective and unreal phenomenon, there still remains the earthquake, to which supernatural incident of the crucifixion none of the other Evangelists think it worth while to refer. Need we argue that the earthquake is as mythical as the resurrection of the saints? In some apocryphal writings even the names of some of these risen saints are given.[2] As the case actually stands, with these marvellous incidents related solely by the first Synoptist and ignored by the other Evangelists, it would seem superfluous to enter upon more detailed criticism of the passage, and to point out the incongruity of the fact that these saints are said to be raised from the dead just as the Messiah expires, or the strange circumstance that, although the sepulchres are said to have been opened at that moment and the resurrection to have then taken place, it is stated that they only came out of their graves after the resurrection of Jesus. The allegation, moreover, that they were raised from the dead at that time, and before the resurrection of Jesus, virtually contradicts the saying of the Apocalypse (i. 5) that Jesus was the "first begotten of the dead," and of Paul (1 Cor. xv. 20) that he was "the first fruits of them who had fallen asleep."[3] Paul's whole argument is opposed to such a story; for he does not base the resurrection of the dead upon the death of Jesus, but, in contradistinction, upon his resurrection only. The Synoptist evidently desires to associate the

[1] Farrar, *ib.*, ii., p. 419. Dean Milman, following the explanation of Michaelis, says: "Even the dreadful earthquake which followed seemed to pass away without appalling the enemies of Jesus. The rending of the veil of the Temple from the top to the bottom, so strikingly significant of the abolition of the local worship, would either be concealed by the priesthood, or attributed as a natural effect to the convulsion of the earth. The same convulsion would displace the stones which covered the ancient tombs and lay open many of the innumerable rock-hewn sepulchres which perforated the hills on every side of the city, and expose the dead to public view. To the awe-struck and depressed minds of the followers of Jesus, no doubt, were confined those visionary appearances of these spirits of their deceased brethren, which are obscurely intimated in the rapid narratives of the Evangelists" (*Hist. of Christianity*, i., p. 336). It will be observed that, inadvertently, Dr. Milman has put "Evangelists" in the plural.

[2] *Anaphora Pilati*, Thilo, *Cod. Apoc. N. T.*, p. 810 f.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 424.

[3] Can the author of the Apocalypse or Paul ever have heard of the raising of Lazarus?

resurrection of the saints with the death of Jesus to render that event more impressive, but delays the completion of it in order to give a kind of precedence to the resurrection of the Master. The attempt leads to nothing but confusion. What could be the object of such a resurrection? It could not be represented as any effect produced by the death of Jesus, nor even by his alleged resurrection, for what dogmatic connection could there be between that event and the fact that a few saints only were raised from their graves, whilst it was not pretended that the dead "saints" generally participated in this resurrection? No intimation is given that their appearance to many was for any special purpose, and certainly no practical result has ever been traced to it. Finally we might ask: What became of these saints raised from the dead? Did they die again? Or did they also "ascend into Heaven"? A little reflection will show that these questions are pertinent. It is almost inconceivable that any serious mind could maintain the actual truth of such a story, upon such evidence. Its objective truth not being maintainable, however, the character of the work which advances such an unhesitating statement is determined, and the value of its testimony can without difficulty be settled.

The continuation of this episode in the first Synoptic is quite in keeping with its commencement. It is stated: "But when the centurion and they that were with him watching Jesus saw the earthquake (σεισμὸν) and the things that were done (τὰ γενόμενα) they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was a son of God" (Ἀληθῶς υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν οὗτος).[1] In Mark the statement is very curiously varied: "And when the centurion who stood over against him saw that he so expired, he said: Truly this man was a son of God."[2] It is argued on the one hand that the centurion's wonder was caused by Jesus dying with so loud a cry, and the reading of many MSS. would clearly support this;[3] and on the other that the cause of his exclamation was the unexpectedly rapid death of Jesus. Whichever view be taken, the centurion's deduction, it must be admitted, rests upon singularly inconclusive reasoning.

[1] Matt. xxvii. 54. This is the reading of the Vatican Cod. and D, with some others. Cod. A, C, E, F, and many others, read θεοῦ υἱὸς. The Sinaitic MS. has Ἀλ. υἱὸς ἦν τοῦ θεοῦ οὗτος. The rendering of the A. V., "the Son of God," cannot be sustained linguistically, whatever may have been the writer's intention.

[2] Mark xv. 39. The A. V. has: "saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost"; κράξας has certainly high authority (A, C, E, G, H, etc.; D has κράξαντα), but the Sin., Vat., and some other codices and versions, omit it, and it is rejected by Tischendorf. We, therefore, take the reading for the moment which leaves the question most open.

[3] Meyer, who takes the view, considers that, hearing Jesus expire with so loud a cry, the centurion concluded him to be a "Hero" (*Ev. des Mark u. Lukas, 5te Aufl.*, 203 f.).

We venture to think that it is impossible that a Roman soldier could either have been led to form such an opinion upon such grounds, or to express it in such terms. In Luke we have a third reading: "But when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, Certainly this man was righteous"[1] (Ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν). There is nothing here about the "Son of God"; but when the writer represents the Roman soldier as glorifying God the narrative does not seem much more probable than that of the other Synoptists.

The fourth Evangelist does not refer to any such episode, but, as usual, introduces a very remarkable incident of his own, of which the Synoptists, who record such peculiar details of what passed, seem very strangely to know nothing. The fourth Evangelist states: "The Jews, therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies might not remain upon the cross on the sabbath (for that sabbath-day was a high day), besought Pilate that their legs might be broken and they might be taken away. So the soldiers came and brake the legs of the first, and of the other who was crucified with him; but when they came to Jesus, as they saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs: but one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith there came out blood and water. And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true; and that man knoweth that he saith what is true, that ye also may believe. For these things came to pass that the Scripture might be fulfilled: A bone of him shall not be broken. And again another Scripture saith: They shall look on him whom they pierced."[2] It is inconceivable that, if this actually occurred, and occurred more especially that the "Scripture might be fulfilled," the other three Evangelists could thus totally ignore it all.[3] The second Synoptist does more: he not only ignores, but excludes it; for (xv. 43 f.) he represents Joseph as begging the body of Jesus from Pilate "when evening was now come." "And Pilate marvelled if he were already dead; and, calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether he had been long dead. And, when he knew it of the centurion, he gave the corpse to Joseph."[4] Now, although there could be no doubt on the point, the fourth Gospel clearly states (xix. 38, μετὰ ταῦτα) that Joseph made his request for the body after the order had been given by Pilate to break the legs of the crucified, and after it had been executed as above described. If Pilate had already given

[1] xxiii. 47. [2] John xix. 31–37.

[3] The Sin., Vat., and other codices insert in Matt. xxvii. 49 the phrase from John xix. 34, ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην, ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα. Notwithstanding this high authority, it is almost universally acknowledged that the phrase is an interpolation here.

[4] Mark xv. 44–45.

the order to break the legs, how is it possible he could have marvelled, or acted as he is described in Mark to have done?

It is well known that the Crurifragium, which is here applied, was not usually an accompaniment of crucifixion, though it may have been sometimes employed along with it,[1] but that it was a distinct punishment. It consisted in breaking, with hammers or clubs, the bones of the condemned from the hips to the feet. We shall not discuss whether, in the present case, this measure really was adopted or not. The representation is that the Jews requested Pilate to break the legs of the crucified that the bodies might be removed before the Sabbath, and that the order was given and executed. The first point to be noted is the very singular manner in which the leg-breaking was performed. The soldiers are said to have broken the legs of the first, and then of the other who was crucified with Jesus, thus passing over Jesus in the first instance; and then the Evangelist says: "*but when they came to Jesus*, as they saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs, but one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side." This order of procedure is singular; but the whole conduct of the guard is so extraordinary that such details become comparatively insignificant. An order having been given to the Roman soldiers, in accordance with the request of the Jews, to break the legs of the crucified, we are asked to believe that they did not execute it in the case of Jesus! It is not reasonable to suppose that Roman soldiers either were in the habit of disregarding their orders, or could have any motive for doing so in this case, and subjecting themselves to the severe punishment for disobedience inflicted by Roman military law. It is argued that they saw that Jesus was already dead, and, therefore, that it was not necessary to break his legs; but soldiers are not in the habit of thinking in this way: they are disciplined to obey. The fact is that the certainty that Jesus was dead already did not actually exist in their minds, for, in that case, why should the soldier have pierced his side with a spear? The only conceivable motive for doing so was to make sure that Jesus really was dead; but is it possible to suppose that a Roman soldier, being in the slightest doubt, actually chose to assure himself in this way when he might still more effectually have done so by simply obeying the order of his superior and breaking the legs? The whole episode is manifestly unhistorical.

It is clear that to fulfil in a marked way the prophecies which the writer had in his mind, and wished specially to apply to Jesus, it was necessary that, in the first place, there should have been a distinct danger of the bones being broken, and at the

[1] Ebrard admits that it was not common (*Evang. Gesch.*, p. 565, anm. 31).

same time of the side not being pierced. The order to break the legs of the crucified is therefore given, but an extraordinary exception is made in favour of Jesus, and a thrust with the lance substituted, so that both passages of the Scripture are supposed to be fulfilled. What Scriptures, however, are fulfilled? The first, "A bone of him shall not be broken," is merely the prescription with regard to the Paschal lamb, Ex. xii. 46,[1] and the dogmatic view of the fourth Evangelist leads him throughout to represent Jesus as the true Paschal lamb. The second is Zech. xii. 10,[2] and anyone who reads the passage, even without the assistance of learned exegesis, may perceive that it has no such application as our Evangelist gives it. We shall pass over, as not absolutely necessary for our immediate purpose, very many important details of the episode; but regarding this part of the subject we may say that we consider it evident that, if an order was given to break the legs of the crucified upon this occasion, that order must have been executed upon Jesus equally with any others who may have been crucified with him.

There has been much discussion as to the intention of the author in stating that, from the wound made by the lance, there forthwith came out "blood and water" (*αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ*); and likewise as to whether the special testimony here referred to in the third person is to attest more immediately the flow of blood and water, or the whole episode.[3] In regard to the latter point, we need not pause to discuss the question. As to the "blood and water," some see in the statement made an intention to show the reality of the death of Jesus, whilst others more rightly regard the phenomenon described as a representation of a supernatural and symbolical incident, closely connected with the whole dogmatic view of the Gospel. It is impossible not to see in this the same idea as that expressed in 1 John v. 6: "This is he that came by water and blood, Jesus Christ; not in the water only, but in the water and the blood."[4] As a natural incident it cannot be entertained, for in no sense but mere quibbling could it be said that "blood and water" could flow from such a wound, and as a supernatural phenomenon it must be rejected. As a proof of the reality of the death of Jesus, it could only have been thought of at a time when gross ignorance prevailed upon all medical subjects. We shall not here discuss the reality of the death of Jesus, but we may merely point out that

[1] Cf. Numbers ix. 12; Ps. xxxiv. 20.

[2] Cf. Ps. xxii. 16. We need not discuss here the variation in the quotation from Zech. xii. 10.

[3] Of course we do not here even touch upon the wider question raised by this passage.

[4] Cf. John vii. 37–39, iii. 5, etc.

the almost unprecedentedly rapid decease of Jesus was explained by Origen[1] and some of the Fathers as miraculous. It has been argued that the thrust of the lance may have been intended to silence those objectors who might have denied the actual death on the ground that the legs of Jesus were not broken like those of the two malefactors,[2] and it certainly is generally quoted as having assured the fact of death. The statement that blood flowed from the wound by no means supports the allegation; and, although we may make little use of the argument, it is right to say that there is no evidence of any serious kind advanced of the reality of the death of Jesus, here or in the other Gospels.[3]

The author of the fourth Gospel himself seems to betray that this episode is a mere interpolation of his own into a narrative to which it does not properly belong. According to his own account (xix. 31), the Jews besought Pilate that the legs might be broken and that the bodies "might be taken away" (*ἀρθῶσιν*). The order to do this was obviously given, for the legs are forthwith broken, and, of course, immediately after, the bodies, in pursuance of the same order, would have been taken away. As soon as the Evangelist has secured his purpose of showing how the Scriptures were fulfilled by means of this episode, he takes up the story as though it had not been interrupted, and proceeds verse 38: "After these things" (*μετὰ ταῦτα*), that is to say after the legs of the malefactors had been broken and the side of Jesus pierced, Joseph besought Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus, and Pilate gave leave. But, if verse 31 f. be historical, the body must already have been taken away. All the Synoptics agree with the fourth Gospel in stating that Joseph of Arimathæa begged for and obtained the body of Jesus from Pilate.[4] The second and third Synoptics describe him as belonging to the Council, but the first Gospel merely calls him "a rich man," whilst the fourth omits both of these descriptions. They all call him a disciple of Jesus—secretly for fear of the Jews, the fourth Gospel characteristically adds—although the term that he was "waiting for the Kingdom of God," used by the second and third Gospels, is somewhat vague. The fourth Gospel introduces a second personage in the

[1] "*Oravit Patrem, et exauditus est, et statim ut clamavit ad Patrem, receptus est aut sicut qui potestatem habebat ponendi animam suam, posuit eam quando voluit ipse.....Miraculum enim erat quoniam post tres horas receptus est,*" *etc.* (Orig. *in Matth. ed. Delarue,* 1740, iii., § 140, p. 928).

[2] The use of the verb *νύσσω* does not favour the view that the writer intended to express a deep wound.

[3] It has likewise been thought that the representation in Mark xv. 44, that Pilate marvelled at the rapid death of Jesus, and sent for the centurion to ascertain the fact, was made to meet similar doubts, or at least to give assurance of the reality of the death.

[4] According to Luke xxiii. 53, Joseph actually "took down" the body.

shape of Nicodemus, "who at the first came to him by night,"[1] and who, it will be remembered, had previously been described as "a ruler of the Jews."[2] The Synoptics do not once mention such a person, either in the narrative of the Passion or in the earlier chapters, and there are more than doubts as to his historical character.

The accounts of the Entombment given by the three Synoptists, or at least by the second and third, distinctly exclude the narrative of the fourth Gospel, both as regards Nicodemus and the part he is represented as taking. The contradictions which commence here between the account of the fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, in fact, are of the most glaring and important nature, and demand marked attention. The fourth Gospel states that, having obtained permission from Pilate, Joseph came and took the body of Jesus away. "And there came also Nicodemus.....bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pound weight. They took, therefore, the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen cloths with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. Now, in the place where he was crucified there was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre wherein was never man yet laid. There, therefore, on account of the preparation of the Jews (ἐκεῖ οὖν διὰ τὴν παρασκευὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων), they laid Jesus, for the sepulchre was at hand" (ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ μνημεῖον).[3]

According to the first Synoptic, when Joseph took the body, he simply wrapped it "in clean linen" (ἐν σινδόνι καθαρᾷ) and "laid it in his own new sepulchre, which he hewed in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed."[4] There is no mention of spices or any anointing of the body, and the statement that the women provide for this is not made in this Gospel. According to the writer, the burial is complete, and the sepulchre finally closed. Mary Magdalene and the other Mary come merely "to behold the sepulchre" at the end of the Sabbath.[5] The fourth Evangelist apparently does not know anything of the sepulchre being Joseph's own tomb, and the body is, according to him, although fully embalmed, only laid in the sepulchre in the garden on account of the Sabbath and because it was at hand. We shall refer to this point, which must be noted, further on.

There are very striking differences between these two accounts, but the narratives of the second and third Synoptists are still more emphatically contradictory of both. In Mark[6] we are told that Joseph "brought linen, and took him down and wrapped him in

[1] John iii. 1.
[2] *Ib.*, iii. 1, vii. 50.
[3] *Ib.*, xix. 39–42.
[4] Matt. xxvii. 59 f.
[5] *Ib.*, xxviii. 1.
[6] Mark xv. 46.

the linen, and laid him in a sepulchre which had been hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone against the door of the sepulchre." There is no mention here of any embalming performed by Joseph or Nicodemus, nor are any particulars given as to the ownership of the sepulchre, or the reasons for its selection. We are, however, told[1]: "And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, bought spices that they might come and anoint him." It is distinctly stated in connection with the entombment, moreover, in agreement with the first Synoptic[2]: "And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid."[3] According to this account and that of the first Gospel, the women, having remained to the last and seen the body deposited in the sepulchre, knew so little of its having been embalmed by Joseph and Nicodemus that they actually purchase the spices and come to perform that office themselves.

In Luke the statement is still more specific, in agreement with Mark, and in contradiction to the fourth Gospel. Joseph took down the body "and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone, wherein never man before was laid..... And women who had come with him out of Galilee followed after, and beheld the sepulchre *and how his body was laid.* And they returned and prepared spices and ointments." Upon the first day of the week, the author adds, "they came unto the sepulchre bringing the spices which they had prepared."[4]

Which of these accounts are we to believe? According to the first Gospel, there is no embalmment at all; according to the second and third Gospels, the embalmment is undertaken by the women, and not by Joseph and Nicodemus, but is never carried out; according to the fourth Gospel, the embalmment is completed on Friday evening by Joseph and Nicodemus, and not by the women. According to the first Gospel, the burial is completed on Friday evening; according to the second and third, it is only provisional; and according to the fourth, the embalmment is final, but it is doubtful whether the entombment is final or temporary; several critics consider it to have been only provisional. In Mark the women buy the spices "when the Sabbath was past" (διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου);[5] in Luke before it has begun;[6] and in Matthew and John they do not buy them at all. In the first and fourth Gospels the women come after the Sabbath merely to behold the sepulchre,[7] and in the second and third they bring the

[1] Mark xvi. 1.
[2] Matt. xxvii. 61.
[3] Mark xv. 47.
[4] Luke xxiii. 53 f., xxiv. 1.
[5] Mark xvi. 1.
[6] Luke xxiii. 35.
[7] Matt. xxviii. 1; John xx. 1.

spices to complete the burial. Amid these conflicting statements we may suggest one consideration. It is not probable, in a hot climate, that a wounded body, hastily laid in a sepulchre on Friday evening before six o'clock, would be disturbed again on Sunday morning for the purpose of being anointed and embalmed. Corruption would, under the circumstances, already have commenced. Besides, as Keim[1] has pointed out, the last duties to the dead were not forbidden amongst the Jews on the Sabbath, and there is really no reason why any care for the body of the Master which reverence or affection might have dictated should not at once have been bestowed.

The enormous amount of myrrh and aloes—"about a hundred pound weight" (ὡς λίτρας ἑκατόν)—brought by Nicodemus has excited much discussion, and adds to the extreme improbability of the story related by the fourth Evangelist. To whatever weight the litra may be reduced, the quantity specified is very great; and it is a question whether the body thus enveloped "as the manner of the Jews is to bury" could have entered the sepulchre. The practice of embalming the dead, although well known amongst the Jews, and invariable in the case of kings and noble or very wealthy persons, was by no means generally prevalent. In the burial of Gamaliel the elder, chief of the party of the Pharisees, it is stated that over eighty pounds of balsam were burnt in his honour by the proselyte Onkelos; but this quantity, which was considered very remarkable, is totally eclipsed by the provision of Nicodemus.

The key to the whole of this history of the burial of Jesus, however, is to be found in the celebrated chapter liii. of "Isaiah." We have already, in passing, pointed out that, in the third Gospel (xxii. 37), Jesus is represented as saying: "For I say unto you, that this which is written must be accomplished in me: And he was reckoned among transgressors." The same quotation from Is. liii. 12 is likewise interpolated in Mark xv. 28. Now the whole representation of the burial and embalmment of Jesus is evidently based upon the same chapter, and more especially upon verse 9, which is wrongly rendered both in the Authorised Version and in the Septuagint, in the latter of which the passage reads: "I will give the wicked for his grave and the rich for his death."[2] The Evangelists, taking this to be the sense of the passage, which they suppose to be a Messianic prophecy, have represented the death of Jesus as being with the wicked, crucified as he is between two robbers; and through Joseph of Arimathæa, significantly called

[1] *Schabbath* 151. 1; Keim, *Jesu von Nazara*, iii. 522, anm. 1.

[2] Καὶ δώσω τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ. Is. liii. 9.

"a rich man" (ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος) by the first Synoptist, especially according to the fourth Evangelist by his addition of the counsellor Nicodemus and his hundred pounds weight of mingled myrrh and aloes, as being "with the rich in his death." Unfortunately, the passage in the "prophecy" does not mean what the Evangelists have been led to understand, and the ablest Hebrew scholars and critics are now agreed that both phrases quoted refer, in true Hebrew manner, to one representation, and that the word above translated "rich" is not used in a favourable sense, but that the passage must be rendered: "And they made his grave with the wicked and his sepulchre with the evil-doers," or words to that effect. Without going minutely into the details of opinion on the subject of the "servant of Jehovah" in this writing of the Old Testament, we may add that upon one point at least the great majority of critics are of one accord: that Is. liii. and other passages of "Isaiah" describing the sufferings of the "Servant of Jehovah" have no reference to the Messiah. As we have touched upon this subject, it may not be out of place to add that Psalms xxii. and lxix., which are so frequently quoted in connection with the passion, and represented by New Testament and other early writers as Messianic, are determined, by sounder principles of criticism applied to them in modern times, not to refer to the Messiah at all.

We now come to a remarkable episode, which is peculiar to the first Synoptic and strangely ignored by all the other Gospels. It is stated that the next day—that is to say, on the Sabbath—the chief priests and the Pharisees came together to Pilate, saying: "Sir, we remember that that deceiver said while he was yet alive: After three days I am raised (Μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐγείρομαι). Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come and steal him away and say unto the people: He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them: Ye have a guard (Ἔχετε κουστωδίαν): go, make it as sure as ye can. So they went and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, with the guard."[1] Not only do the other Evangelists pass over this strange proceeding in total silence, but their narratives, or at least those of the second and third Synoptists, exclude it. The women came with their spices to embalm the body, in total ignorance of there being any guard to interfere with their performance of that last sad office for the Master. We are asked to believe that the chief priests and the Pharisees actually desecrated the Sabbath by sealing the stone, and visited the house of the heathen Pilate on so holy a day, for the purpose of asking for the guard.[2] These

[1] Matt. xxvii. 62–66. [2] Cf. John xviii. 28, xix. 31.

priests are said to have remembered and understood a prophecy of Jesus regarding his resurrection, of which his disciples are represented to be in ignorance.[1] The remark about "the last error," moreover, is very suspicious. The ready acquiescence of Pilate is quite incredible.[2] That he should employ Roman soldiers to watch the sepulchre of a man who had been crucified cannot be entertained; and his friendly, "Go, make it as sure as ye can," is not in the spirit of Pilate. It is conceivable that to satisfy their clamour he may, without much difficulty, have consented to crucify a Jew, more especially as his crime was of a political character represented as in some degree affecting the Roman power; but, once crucified, it is not in the slightest degree likely that Pilate would care what became of his body, and still less that he would employ Roman soldiers to mount guard over it.

It may be as well to dispose finally of this episode, so we at once proceed to its conclusion. When the resurrection takes place, it is stated that some of the guard went into the city, and, instead of making their report to Pilate, as might have been expected, told the chief priests all that had occurred. A council is held, and the soldiers are largely bribed, and instructed: "Say that his disciples came by night and stole him while we slept. And if this come to the governor's ears we will persuade him and make you free from care. So they took the money and did as they were taught."[3] Nothing could be more simple than the construction of the story, which follows the usual broad lines of legend. The idea of Roman soldiers confessing that they slept whilst on watch, and allowed that to occur which they were there to prevent! and this to oblige the chief priests and elders, at the risk of their lives! Then, are we to suppose that the chief priests and council believed this story of the earthquake and angel, and yet acted in this way? and if they did not believe it, would not the very story itself have led to the punishment of the men, and to the confirmation of the report they desired to spread, that the disciples had stolen the body? The large bribe seems to have been very ineffectual, since the Christian historian is able to report precisely what the chief priests and elders instruct them to say.[4] Is it not palpable that the whole story is legendary?

[1] Cf. John xx. 9.

[2] It has been argued that Pilate does not give a Roman guard, but merely permits the chief priests to make use of their own guard. This, however, is opposed to the whole tenour of the story, and the suggestion is generally rejected. Tertullian says: "*Tunc Judæi detractum et sepulchro conditum magna etiam militaris custodiæ diligentia circumsederunt*" (*Apol.*, § 21).

[3] Matt. xxviii. 11–15.

[4] Olshausen, to obviate the difficulty of supposing that the Sanhedrin did all this, supposes that Caiaphas the high priest may have been the principal agent (*Bibl. Comm.*, ii. 2, p. 190 f.).

If it be so, and we think this cannot be doubted, a conclusion which the total silence of the other Gospels seems to confirm, very suggestive consequences may be deduced from it. The first Synoptist, referring to the false report which the Sanhedrin instruct the soldiers to make, says: "And this saying was spread among the Jews unto this day."[1] The probable origin of the legend may have been an objection to the Christian affirmation of the resurrection to the above effect; but it is instructive to find that Christian tradition was equal to the occasion, and invented a story to refute it. It is the tendency to this very system of defence and confirmation, everywhere apparent, which renders early Christian tradition so mythical and untrustworthy.

We now enter upon the narrative of the Resurrection itself. The first Synoptist relates that Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to behold the sepulchre "at the close of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn into the first day of the week" (Ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων),[2] that is to say, shortly after six o'clock on the evening of Saturday, the end of the Sabbath, the dawn of the next day being marked by the glimmer of more than one star in the heavens. The second Synoptic represents that, "when the Sabbath was past," Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome bought spices, and that they came to the sepulchre "very early on the first day of the week after the rising of the sun" (καὶ λίαν πρωΐ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων.....ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου).[3] The third Synoptist states that the women who came with Jesus from Galilee came to the sepulchre, but he subsequently more definitely names them: "Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and the other women with them"[4]—a larger number of women—and they came "upon the first day of the week at early dawn" (Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ὄρθρου βαθέως). The fourth Evangelist represents that Mary Magdalene only[5] came to the sepulchre, on the first day of the week, "early, while it was yet dark" (πρωΐ σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης).[6]

The first Evangelist indubitably makes the hour at which the women come to the sepulchre different and much earlier than the others, and at the same time he represents them as witnessing the actual removal of the stone, which, in the other three Gospels, the women already find rolled away from the mouth of the sepulchre.[7] It will, therefore, be interesting to follow the first Synoptic. It is

[1] Matt. xxviii. 15.
[2] *Ib.*, xxviii. 1.
[3] Mark xvi. 2.
[4] Luke xxiii. 55, xxiv. 1, 10.
[5] It is argued from the οἴδαμεν of xx. 2 that there were others with her, although they are not named.
[6] John xx. 1.
[7] Mark xvi. 4; Luke xxiv. 2; John xx. 1.

here stated: 2. "And behold there was a great earthquake (σεισμὸς): for an angel of the Lord descended from heaven and came and rolled away the stone and sat upon it. 3. His appearance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow. 4. And for fear of him the keepers did shake and became as dead men. 5. And the angel answered and said unto the women: Fear ye not, for I know that ye seek Jesus, who hath been crucified. 6. He is not here: for he was raised (ἠγέρθη γάρ), as he said: Come, see the place where he lay. 7. And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he was raised (ἠγέρθη) from the dead, and behold he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him: behold, I have told you. 8. And they departed quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy; and ran to tell his disciples."[1] We have here in the first place another earthquake, and apparently, on the theory of the course of cosmical phenomena held during the "Age of Miracles," produced by the angel who descended to roll away the stone from the sepulchre. This earthquake, like the others recorded in the first Synoptic, appears to be quite unknown to the other Evangelists, and no trace of it has been pointed out in other writings. With the appearance of the angel we obviously arrive upon thoroughly unhistorical ground. Can we believe, because this unknown writer tells us so, that "an angel,"[2] causing an earthquake, actually descended and took such a part in this transaction? Upon the very commonest principles of evidence, the reply must be an emphatic negative. Every fact of science, every lesson of experience, excludes such an assumption; and we may add that the character of the author, with which we are now better acquainted, as well as the course of the narrative itself, confirms the justice of such a conclusion. If the introduction of the angel be legendary, must not also his words be so?

Proceeding to examine the narrative as it stands, we must point out a circumstance which may appropriately be mentioned here, and which is well worthy of attention. The women and the guard are present when the stone is rolled away from the sepulchre, but they do not witness the actual Resurrection. It is natural to suppose that, when the stone was removed, Jesus, who, it is asserted, rises with his body from the dead, would have come forth from the sepulchre: but not so; the angel only says (verse 6): "He is not here, for he was raised (ἠγέρθη γάρ)"; and he merely invites the women to see the place where he lay. The actual resurrection is spoken of as a thing which had taken place before,

[1] Matt. xxviii. 2.

[2] Compare his description with Dan. x. 6. It is worthy of consideration also that when Daniel is cast into the den of lions a stone is rolled upon the mouth of the den, and sealed with the signet of the king and his lords (vi. 17).

and, in any case, it was not witnessed by anyone. In the other Gospels the resurrection has already occurred before anyone arrives at the sepulchre; and the remarkable fact is, therefore, absolutely undeniable that there was not, and that it is not even pretended that there was, a single eye-witness of the actual Resurrection. The empty grave, coupled with the supposed subsequent appearances of Jesus, is the only evidence of the Resurrection. We shall not, however, pursue this further at present. The removal of the stone is not followed by any visible result. The inmate of the sepulchre is not observed to issue from it, and yet he is not there. May we not ask what was the use, in this narrative, of the removal of the stone at all? As no one apparently came forth, the only purpose seems to have been to permit those from without to enter and see that the sepulchre was empty.

Another remarkable point is that the angel desires the women to go quickly and inform the disciples, "he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him." One is tempted to inquire why, as he rose from the dead in Jerusalem, and, in spite of previous statements, the disciples are represented as being there also,[1] Jesus did not appear to them in the Holy City, instead of sending them some three days' journey off to Galilee. At the same time, Jesus is represented by the first two Synoptics as saying at the Last Supper, when warning the disciples that they will all be offended at him that night and be scattered: "But after I shall have been raised I will go before you into Galilee."[2] At present we have only to call attention to the fact that the angel gives the order. With much surprise, therefore, we immediately after read that, as the women departed quickly to tell the disciples in obedience to the angel's message (verse 9): "Behold Jesus met them, saying, Hail. And they came up to him and laid hold of his feet, and worshipped him. 10. Then saith Jesus unto them: Be not afraid; go, tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there they shall see me."[3] What was the use of the angel's message, since Jesus himself immediately after appears and delivers the very same instructions in person? This sudden and apparently unnecessary appearance has all the character of an afterthought. One point is very clear: that the order to go into Galilee and the statement that there first Jesus is to appear to the disciples are unmistakable, repeated and peremptory.

We must now turn to the second Gospel. The women going to the sepulchre with spices that they might anoint the body of Jesus—which, according to the fourth Gospel, had already been fully embalmed, and, in any case, had lain in the sepulchre

[1] Luke xxiv. 33; John xx. 18 f. [2] Matt. xxvi. 32; Mark xiv. 28.
[3] *Ib.*, xxviii. 9, 10.

since the Friday evening—are represented as saying amongst themselves: "Who will roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?"[1] This is a curious dramatic speculation, but very suspicious. These women are apparently not sufficiently acquainted with Joseph of Arimathæa to be aware that, as the fourth Gospel asserts, the body had already been embalmed, and yet they actually contemplate rolling the stone away from the mouth of the sepulchre which was his property.[2] Keim has pointed out that it was a general rule[3] that, after a sepulchre had been closed in the way described, it should not again be opened. Generally, the stone was not placed against the opening of the sepulchre till the third day, when corruption had already commenced; but here the sepulchre is stated by all the Gospels to have been closed on the first day, and the unhesitating intention of the women to remove the stone is not a happy touch on the part of the second Synoptist. They find the stone already rolled away.[4] Verse 5: "And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were affrighted. 6. And he saith unto them: Be not affrighted: Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, the crucified: he was raised (ἠγέρθη); he is not here; behold the place where they laid him. 7. But go, tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you unto Galilee; there shall ye see him, as he said unto you. 8. And they went out and fled from the sepulchre: for trembling and astonishment seized them, and they said nothing to anyone; for they were afraid."[5] In Matthew the angel rolls away the stone from the sepulchre and sits upon it, and the women only enter to see where Jesus lay, upon his invitation. Here, they go in at once, and see the angel ("a young man") sitting at the right side, and are affrighted. He re-assures them, and, as in the other narrative, says, "he was raised." He gives them the same message to his disciples and to Peter, who is specially named; and the second Synoptic thus fully confirms the first in representing Galilee as the place where Jesus is to be seen by them. It is curious that the women should say nothing to anyone about this wonderful event, and in this the statements of the other Gospels are certainly not borne out. There is one remarkable point to be noticed, that, according to the second Synoptist also, not only is there no eye-witness of the Resurrection, but the only evidence of that marvellous occurrence which it contains is the information of the

[1] Mark xvi. 3. [2] Keim, *Jesu v. Nazara*, iii., p. 522. [3] *Ib.*, iii. 522, anm. 1.

[4] Mark xvi. 4. The continuation, "for it was very great" (ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα), is peculiar, but of course intended to represent the difficulty of its removal.

[5] Mark xvi. 5.

"young man." There is no appearance of Jesus to anyone narrated, and it would seem as though the appearance described in Matt. xxviii. 9 f. is excluded. It is well known that Mark xvi. 9-20 did not form part of the original Gospel, and is inauthentic. It is unnecessary to argue a point so generally admitted. The verses now appended to the Gospel are by a different author, and are of no value as evidence. We, therefore, exclude them from consideration.

In Luke, as in the second Synoptic, the women find the stone removed, and here it is distinctly stated that "on entering in they found not the body of the Lord Jesus. 4. And it came to pass as they were perplexed thereabout, behold two men stood by them in shining garments; 5. And as they were afraid, and bowed their faces to the earth, they said unto them: Why seek ye the living among the dead? 6. He is not here, but was raised (ἠγέρθη); remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee; 7. saying, that the Son of Man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified and the third day rise again. 8. And they remembered his words, 9. and returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven and to all the rest.....11. And these words appeared to them as an idle tale, and they believed them not."[1] The author of the third Gospel is not content with one angel, like the first two Synoptists, but introduces "two men in shining garments," who seem suddenly to stand beside the women, and, instead of re-assuring them, as in the former narratives, rather adopt a tone of reproof (verse 5). They inform the women that "Jesus was raised"; and here again not only has no one been an eye-witness of the resurrection, but the women only hear of it from the angels. There is one striking peculiarity in the above account. There is no mention of Jesus going before his disciples into Galilee to be seen of them, nor indeed of his being seen at all; but "Galilee" is introduced by way of a reminiscence. Instead of the future, the third Synoptist substitutes the past, and, as might be expected, he gives no hint of any appearances of Jesus to the disciples beyond the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. When the women tell the disciples what they have seen and heard, they do not believe them. The thief on the cross, according to the writer, was more advanced in his faith and knowledge than the Apostles. Setting aside Matt. xxviii. 9, 10, we have hitherto no other affirmation of the Resurrection than the statement that the sepulchre was found empty, and the angels announced that Jesus was raised from the dead.

[1] Luke xxiv. 3-9, 11. It is unnecessary to say that verse 12 is a later interpolation.

The account of the fourth Evangelist differs completely from the narratives of all the Synoptists. According to him, Mary Magdalene alone comes to the sepulchre and sees the stone taken away. She, therefore, runs and comes to Simon Peter and to "the other disciple whom Jesus loved," saying: "They took (ἦραν) the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not (οὐκ οἴδαμεν)[1] where they laid (ἔθηκαν) him. 3. Peter, therefore, went forth and the other disciple, and came to the sepulchre. 4. And the two ran together; and the other disciple outran Peter and came first to the sepulchre; 5. and stooping down, looking in, he seeth the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in. 6. Then cometh Simon Peter following him and went into the sepulchre and beholdeth the linen clothes lying, 7. and the napkin that was on his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped in one place by itself. 8. Then went in, therefore, the other disciple also, who came first to the sepulchre, and he saw and believed. 9. For as yet they knew not the Scriptures, that he must rise again from the dead. 10. So the disciples went away to their own homes."[2] Critics have long ago pointed out the careful way in which the actions of "the beloved disciple" and Peter are balanced in this narrative. If the "other disciple" outstrips Peter, and first looks into the sepulchre, Peter first actually enters; and if Peter first sees the careful arrangement of the linen clothes, the other sees and believes. The evident care with which the writer metes out a share to each disciple in this visit to the sepulchre, of which the Synoptics seem totally ignorant, is very suggestive of artistic arrangement, and the careful details regarding the folding and position of the linen clothes, which has furnished so much matter for apologetic reasoning, seems to us to savour more of studied composition than natural observation. So very much is passed over in complete silence which is of the very highest importance, that minute details like these, which might well be composed in the study, do not produce so much effect as some critics think they should do. There is some ambiguity as to what the disciple "believed," according to verse 8, when he went into the sepulchre; and some understand that he simply believed what Mary Magdalene had told them (verse 2), whilst others hold that he believed in the resurrection, which, taken in connection with the following verse, seems undoubtedly to be the author's meaning. If the former were the reading, it would be too trifling a point to be so prominently mentioned, and it would not accord with the contented

[1] From the use of this plural, as we have already pointed out, it is argued that there were others with Mary who are not named. This by no means follows, but if it were the case the peculiarity of the narrative becomes all the more apparent.

[2] John xx. 2–10.

return home of the disciples. Accepting the latter sense, it is instructive to observe the very small amount of evidence with which "the beloved disciple" is content. He simply finds the sepulchre empty and the linen clothes lying, and although no one even speaks of the resurrection, no one professes to have been an eye-witness of it, and "as yet they know not the Scriptures, that he must rise again from the dead," he is nevertheless said to see and believe.

It will have been observed that hitherto, although the two disciples have both entered the sepulchre, there has been no mention of angels: they certainly did not see any. In immediate continuation of the narrative, however, we learn that when they have gone home Mary Magdalene, who was standing without at the tomb weeping, stooped down, and, looking into the sepulchre —where just before the disciples had seen no one—she beheld "two angels in white sitting, one at the head and one at the feet, where the body of Jesus lay. 13. They say unto her: Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them: Because they took away (ἦραν) my Lord, and I know not where they laid him."[1] This, again, is a very different representation and conversation from that reported in the other Gospels. Do we acquire any additional assurance as to the reality of the angels and the historical truth of their intervention from this narrative? We think not. Mary Magdalene repeats to the angels almost the very words she had said to the disciples, verse 2. Are we to suppose that "the beloved disciple," who saw and believed, did not communicate his conviction to the others, and that Mary was left precisely in the same doubt and perplexity as before, without an idea that anything had happened except that the body had been taken away, and she knew not where it had been laid? She appears to have seen and spoken to the angels with singular composure. Their sudden appearance does not even seem to have surprised her.

We must, however, continue the narrative, and it is well to remark the maintenance, at first, of the tone of affected ignorance, as well as the dramatic construction of the whole scene: Verse 14. "Having said this, she turned herself back and beholdeth Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. 15. Jesus saith unto her: Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing that it was the gardener, saith unto him: Sir, if thou didst bear him hence, tell me where thou didst lay him, and I will take him away. 16. Jesus saith unto her: Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him in Hebrew:[2] Rabboni, which

[1] John xx. 12, 13.

[2] This is the reading of the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices, besides D and many other important MSS.

is to say, Master. 17. Jesus saith unto her: Touch me not (Μή μου ἅπτου); for I have not yet ascended to the Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them: I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God. 18. Mary Magdalene cometh announcing to the disciples that she has seen the Lord, and he spake these things unto her."[1]

To those who attach weight to these narratives and consider them historical it must appear astonishing that Mary, who up to the very last had been closely associated with Jesus, does not recognise him when he thus appears to her, but supposes him at first to be the gardener. As part of the evidence of the Gospel such a trait is of much importance, and must hereafter be alluded to. After a couple of days, not know Jesus whom she had daily seen for so long! The interpretation of the reply of Jesus, verse 17, "Touch me not," etc., has long been a bone of contention among critics, but it does not sufficiently affect the inquiry upon which we are engaged to require discussion here. Only one point may be mentioned in passing, that if, as has been supposed in connection with Matt. xxviii. 9, Jesus be understood to repel, as premature, the worship of Mary, that very passage of the first Gospel, in which there is certainly no discouragement of worship, refutes the theory. We shall not say more about the construction of this dialogue, but we may point out that, as so many unimportant details are given throughout the narrative, it is somewhat remarkable that the scene terminates so abruptly, and leaves so much untold that it would have been of the utmost consequence for us to know. What became of Jesus, for instance? Did he vanish suddenly? or did he bid Mary farewell, and leave her like one in the flesh? Did she not inquire why he did not join the brethren? whither he was going? It is scarcely possible to tell us less than the writer has done; and as it cannot be denied that such minor points as where the linen clothes lay, or where Mary "turned herself back" (verse 14), or "turned herself" (verse 16) merely, cannot be compared in interest and importance to the supposed movements and conduct of Jesus under such circumstances, the omission to relate the end of the interview, or more particular details of it, whilst those graphic touches are inserted. is singularly instructive. It is much more important to notice that here again there is no mention of Galilee, nor, indeed, of any intention to show himself to the disciples anywhere, but simply the intimation sent to them: "I ascend unto my Father and your Father," etc. —a declaration which seems emphatically to exclude further "appearances," and to limit the vision of the risen Jesus to Mary Magdalene. Certainly this message implies in the clearest way that the Ascension was

[1] John xx. 14–18.

then to take place, and the only explanation of the abrupt termination of the scene immediately after this is said is, that, as he spoke, Jesus then ascended. The subsequent appearances related in this Gospel must, consequently, either be regarded as an after-thought or as visions of Jesus after he had ascended. This demands serious attention. We shall see that, after sending this message to his disciples, he is represented as appearing to them on the evening of the very same day.

According to the third Synoptic, the first appearance of Jesus to anyone after the Resurrection was not to the women, and not to Mary Magdalene, but to two brethren,[1] who were not Apostles at all, the name of one of whom, we are told, was Cleopas.[2] The story of the walk to Emmaus is very dramatic and interesting, but it is clearly legendary. None of the other Evangelists seem to know anything of it. It is difficult to suppose that Jesus should, after his resurrection, appear first of all to two unknown Christians in this manner, and accompany them in such a journey. The particulars of the story are to the last degree improbable, and in its main features incredible, and it is impossible to consider them carefully without perceiving the transparent inauthenticity of the narrative. The two disciples were going to a village called Emmaus threescore furlongs distant from Jerusalem, and while they are conversing Jesus joins them, "but their eyes were holden that they should not know him." He asks the subject of their discourse, and pretends ignorance, which surprises them. Hearing the expression of their perplexity and depression, he says to them: 25. "O foolish and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets spake. 26. Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things, and enter into his glory? 27. And beginning at Moses and at all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." When they reach the village, he pretends to be going further (verse 28), but they constrain him to stay. 30. "And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, he took the bread and blessed and brake, and gave to them; 31. and their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight." Now, why all this mystery? why were their eyes holden that they should not know him? why pretend ignorance? why make "as though he would go further"? Considering the nature and number of the alleged appearances of Jesus, this episode seems most disproportionate and inexplicable. The final incident completes our conviction of the unreality of the whole episode: after the sacramental blessing and breaking of bread, Jesus vanishes in a manner which removes the story from the domain of history. On their return to

[1] Luke xxiv. 13–34. [2] *Ib.*, verse 18.

Jerusalem, the Synoptist adds that they find the Eleven, and are informed that "the Lord was raised and was seen by Simon." Of this appearance we are not told anything more.

Whilst the two disciples from Emmaus were relating these things to the Eleven, the third Synoptist states that Jesus himself stood in the midst of them: verse 37. "But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they saw a spirit." The apparent intention is to represent a miraculous sudden entry of Jesus into the midst of them, just as he had vanished at Emmaus; but, in order to re-assure them, Jesus is represented as saying: verse 39. "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and behold, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me having. 41. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them: Have ye here any food? 42. And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish.[1] 43. And he took it and did eat before them." The care with which the writer demonstrates that Jesus rose again with his own body is remarkable, for not only does he show his hands and feet, we may suppose for the purpose of exhibiting the wounds made by the nails by which he was affixed to the cross, but he eats, and thereby proves himself to be still possessed of his human organism. It is apparent that there is direct contradiction between this and the representation of his vanishing at Emmaus, and standing in the midst of them now. The Synoptist, who is so lavish in his use of miraculous agency, naturally sees no incongruity here. One or other alternative must be adopted: If Jesus possessed his own body after his resurrection and could eat and be handled, he could not vanish; if he vanished, he could not have been thus corporeal. The aid of a miracle has to be invoked in order to reconcile the representations. We need not here criticise the address which he is supposed to make to the disciples,[2] but we must call attention to the one point that Jesus (verse 49) commands the disciples to tarry in Jerusalem until they be "clothed with power from on high." This completes the exclusion of all appearances in Galilee, for the narrative proceeds to say that Jesus led them out towards Bethany and lifted up his hands and blessed them: verse 51. "And it came to pass, while blessing them, he parted from them, and was carried up into heaven"; whilst they returned to Jerusalem, where they "were continually in the temple" praising God. We shall return to the Ascension presently; but, in the

[1] We omit *καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου*, which is not found in the most ancient codices.

[2] The statement in xxiv. 44, however, is suggestive as showing how the fulfilment of the Prophets and Psalms is in the mind of the writer. We have seen how much this idea influenced the account of the Passion in the Gospels.

meantime, it is well that we should refer to the accounts of the other two Gospels.

According to the fourth Gospel, on the first day of the week, after sending to his disciples the message regarding his Ascension, which we have discussed, when it was evening: xx. 19. "And the doors having been shut where the disciples were, for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst, and saith unto them: Peace be unto you. 20. And having said this, he showed unto them both his hands and his side. The disciples, therefore, rejoiced when they saw the Lord. 21. So then he said to them again: Peace be unto you: as the Father hath sent me, I also send you. 22. And when he said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit: 23. Whosesoever sins ye forgive they are forgiven unto them; whosesoever ye retain they are retained." This appearance of Jesus to the Eleven bears so far analogy to that in the third Gospel, which we have just examined, that it occurs upon the same day and to the same persons. Is it probable that Jesus appeared twice upon the same evening to the eleven disciples? The account in the fourth Gospel itself confirms the only reasonable reply, that he did not do so; but the narrative in the third Synoptic renders the matter certain. That appearance was the first to the Eleven (xxiv. 36 f.), and he then conducted them towards Bethany, and ascended into heaven (verse 50 f.). How, then, we may inquire, could two accounts of the same event differ so fundamentally? It is absolutely certain that both cannot be true. Is it possible to suppose that the third Synoptist could forget to record the extraordinary powers supposed to have been, on this occasion, bestowed upon the ten Apostles to forgive sins and to retain them? Is it conceivable that he would not relate the circumstance that Jesus breathed upon them, and endowed them with the Holy Ghost? Indeed, as regards the latter point, he seems to exclude it; verse 49 and Acts (ii.) certainly represent the descent of the Holy Spirit as taking place at Pentecost. On the other hand, can we suppose that the fourth Evangelist would have ignored the walk to Bethany and the solemn parting there? or the injunction to remain in Jerusalem? not to mention other topics. The two episodes cannot be reconciled.

In the fourth Gospel, instead of showing his hands and feet, Jesus is represented as exhibiting "his hands and his side"; and that this is not accidental is most clearly demonstrated by the fact that Thomas, who is not present, refuses to believe (verse 25) unless he see and put his finger into the print of the nails in his hands and put his hand into his side; and Jesus, when he appears again, allows him (verse 27) to put his finger into his hands and his hand into his side. In the Synoptic the wound made by that

mythical lance is ignored, and, in the fourth Gospel, the wounds in the feet. The omission of the whole episode of the leg-breaking and lance-thrust by the three Synoptics thus gains fresh significance. On the other hand, it may be a question whether, in the opinion of the fourth Evangelist, the feet of Jesus were nailed to the cross at all. It was at least as common, not to say more, that the hands alone of those who were crucified were nailed to the cross, the legs being simply bound to it by cords. Opinion is divided as to whether Jesus was so bound, or whether the feet were likewise nailed; but the point is not important to our examination and need not be discussed, although it has considerable interest in connection with the theory that death did not actually ensue on the cross, but that, having fainted through weakness, Jesus, being taken down after so unusually short a time on the cross, subsequently recovered. There is no final evidence upon the point.

None of the explanations offered by Apologists remove the contradiction between the statement that Jesus bestowed the Holy Spirit upon this occasion, and that of the third Synoptic and Acts. There is, however, a curious point to notice in connection with this: Thomas is said to have been absent upon this occasion, and the representation, therefore, is that the Holy Spirit was only bestowed upon ten of the Apostles. Was Thomas excluded? Was he thus punished for his unbelief? Are we to suppose that an opportunity to bestow the Holy Spirit was selected when one of the Apostles was not present? We have somewhat anticipated the narrative (xx. 24 f.), which relates that upon the occasion above discussed, Thomas, one of the Twelve, was not present, and, hearing from the rest that they have seen the Lord, he declares that he will not believe without palpable proof by touching his wounds. The Evangelist continues: verse 26. "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas was with them. Jesus cometh, the doors having been shut (*τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων*), and stood in the midst and said: Peace be unto you. 27. Then saith he to Thomas: Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and put it into my side, and be not unbelieving, but believing. 28. Thomas answered and said unto him: My Lord and my God. 28. Jesus saith unto him: Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed; blessed are they who have not seen, and yet have believed."

The third Synoptic gives evidence that the risen Jesus is not incorporeal by stating that he not only permitted himself to be handled, but actually ate food in their presence. The fourth Evangelist attains the same result in a more artistic manner through the doubts of Thomas, but in allowing him actually to put his

finger into the prints of the nails in his hands, and his hand into the wound in his side, he asserts that Jesus rose with the same body as that which had hung on the cross. He, too, whilst doing this, actually endows him with the attribute of incorporeality; for, upon both of the occasions which we are discussing, the statement is markedly made that, when Jesus came and stood in the midst, the doors were shut where the disciples were. It can scarcely be doubted that the intention of the writer is to represent a miraculous entry.

We are asked to believe that, when Thomas had convinced himself that it was indeed Jesus in the flesh who stood before him, he went to the opposite extreme of belief and said to Jesus: (καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ) "My Lord and my God"! In representing that Jesus, even before the Ascension, was addressed as "God" by one of the Twelve, the Evangelist commits one of those anachronisms with which we are familiar, in another shape, in the works of great painters, who depict pious bishops of their own time as actors in the scenes of the Passion. These touches betray the hand of the artist, and remove the account from the domain of sober history. In the message sent by Jesus to his disciples he spoke of ascending "to your God and my God," but the Evangelist at the close of his Gospel strikes the same note as that upon which he commenced his philosophical prelude.

We shall only add one further remark regarding this episode, and it is the repetition of one already made. It is much to be regretted that the writer does not inform us how these interviews of Jesus with his disciples terminated. We are told of his entry, but not of his mode of departure. Did he vanish suddenly? Did he depart like other men? Then, it would be important to know where Jesus abode during the interval of eight days. Did he ascend to heaven after each appearance? or did he remain on earth? Why did he not consort as before with his disciples? These are not jeering questions, but serious indications of the scantiness of the information given by the Evangelists, which is not compensated by some trifling detail of no value occasionally inserted to heighten the reality of a narrative. This is the last appearance of Jesus related in the fourth Gospel; for the character of chapter xxi. is too doubtful[1] to permit it to rank with the Gospel. The appearance of Jesus therein related is, in fact, more palpably legendary than the others. It will be observed that in this Gospel, as in the third Synoptic, the appearances of Jesus are confined to Jerusalem and exclude Galilee. These two Gospels are, therefore, clearly in contradiction with the statement of the first two Synoptics.[2]

[1] Cf. p. 538 f.

[2] Matt. xxviii. 7; Mark xvi. 7.

It only remains for us to refer to one more appearance of Jesus: that related in the first Synoptic, xxviii. 16 f. In obedience to the command of Jesus, the disciples are represented as having gone away into Galilee, "unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them." We have not previously heard anything of this specific appointment. The Synoptist continues: verse 17. "And when they saw him they worshipped him, but some doubted. 18. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying: All authority was given to me (ἐδόθη μοι) in heaven and on earth. 19. Go ye and make disciples of all the nations, baptising them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; 20. teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with you all the days, unto the end of the world." This appearance not only is not mentioned in the other Gospels, but it excludes the appearances in Judæa, of which the writer seems to be altogether ignorant. If he knew of them, he practically denies them.

There has been some discussion as to what the doubt mentioned in verse 17 refers, some critics maintaining that "some doubted" as to the propriety of worshipping Jesus; whilst others more correctly consider that they doubted as to his identity: but we need not mention the curious apologetic explanations offered.[1] Are we to regard the mention of these doubts as an "inestimable proof of the candour of the Evangelists"? If so, then we may find fault with the omission to tell us whether, and how, those doubts were set at rest. As the narrative stands the doubts were not resolved. Was it possible to doubt without good reason of the identity of one with whom, until a few days previously, the disciples had been in daily and hourly contact at least for a year, if not longer? Doubt in such a case is infinitely more decisive than belief. We can regard the expression, however, in no other light than as a mere rhetorical device in a legendary narrative. The rest of the account need have little further discussion here. The extraordinary statement in verse 18[2] seems as clearly the expression of later theology as the baptismal formula in verse 19, where the doctrine of the Trinity is so definitely expressed. Some critics suppose that the eleven were not alone upon this occasion, but

[1] Dr. Farrar makes the following remarks on this point: "The *οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν* of Matt. xxviii. 17 can only mean 'but some doubted' not as Wetstein and others take it, whether they should worship or not, but respecting the whole scene. All may not have stood near to Him, and even if they did, we have seen in four previous instances (Matt. xxviii. 17: Luke xxiv. 16, 37: John xxi. 4) that there was something unusual and not instantly recognisable in His resurrection body. At any rate, here we have another inestimable proof of the candour of the Evangelists, for there is nothing to be said in favour of the conjectural emendation *οὐδέ*" (*Life of Christ*, ii. 445, note 1).

[2] This is supposed to be a reference to Daniel vii. 14.

that either all the disciples of Jesus were present, or at least the 500 brethren[1] to whom Paul refers, 1 Cor. xv. 6. This mainly rests on the statement that "some doubted," for it is argued that, after the two previous appearances to the disciples in Jerusalem mentioned by the other Evangelists, it is impossible that the Eleven could have felt doubt, and consequently that others must have been present who had not previously been convinced. It is scarcely necessary to point out the utter weakness of such an argument. It is not permissible to patch on to this Gospel scraps cut out of the others.

It must be clear to every unprejudiced student that the appearances of Jesus narrated by the four Gospels in Galilee and Judæa cannot be harmonised, and we have shown that they actually exclude each other.[2] The first Synoptist records (verse 10) the order for the disciples to go into Galilee, and, with no further interruption than the mention of the return of the discomfited guard from the sepulchre to the chief priest, he (verse 16) states that they went into Galilee, where they saw Jesus in the manner just described. No amount of ingenuity can insert the appearances in Jerusalem here without the grossest violation of all common sense. This is the only appearance to the Eleven recorded in Matthew.

We must again point out the singular omission to relate the manner in which this interview was ended. The episode and the Gospel, indeed, are brought to a very artistic close by the expression, "Lo, I am with you all the days unto the end of the world"; but we must insist that it is a very suggestive fact that it does not occur to these writers to state what became of Jesus. No point could have been more full of interest than the manner in which Jesus here finally leaves the disciples, and is dismissed from the history. That such an important part of the narrative is omitted is in the highest degree remarkable and significant. Had a formal termination to the interview been recounted, it would have been subject to criticism, and by no means necessarily evidence of truth; but it seems to us that the circumstance that it never occurred to these writers to relate the departure of Jesus is a very strong indication of the unreality and shadowy nature of the whole tradition.

[1] Dr. Farrar, without explanation or argument, boldly asserts the presence of the 500 (*Life of Christ*, ii. 445).

[2] Dean Alford, whilst admitting that it is fruitless to attempt a harmony of the different accounts, curiously adds: "... ..Hence the great diversity in this portion of the narrative: and hence I believe much that is now dark might be explained, were the facts themselves, in their order of occurrence, before us. Till that is the case (and I am willing to believe that it will be one of our delightful employments hereafter, to trace the *true* harmony of the Holy Gospels, under His teaching of whom they are the record), we must be content to walk by faith, and not by sight" (*Gk. Test on John*, xx. 1–29, i., p. 905).

We are thus brought to consider the account of the Ascension, which is, at least, given by one Evangelist. In the appendix to the second Gospel, as if the later writer felt the omission and desired to complete the narrative, it is vaguely stated: xvi. 19. "So then after the Lord spake unto them he was taken up into heaven and sat on the right hand of God."[1] The writer, however, omits to state how he was taken up into heaven; and sitting "at the right hand of God" is an act and position which those who assert the "Personality of God" may possibly understand, but which we venture to think betrays that the account is a mere theological figment. The third Synoptist, as we have incidentally shown, gives an account of the Ascension. Jesus having, according to the narrative in xxiv. 50 f., led the disciples out to Bethany, lifted up his hands and blessed them (verse 51): "And it came to pass while blessing them he parted from them, and was carried up into heaven."[2] The whole of the appearances narrated in the third Synoptic, therefore, and the Ascension are thus said to occur on the same day as the Resurrection. In Matthew there is a different representation made, for the time consumed in the journey of the disciples to Galilee obviously throws back the Ascension to a later date. In Mark there is no appearance at all recorded, but the command to the disciples to go into Galilee confirms the first Synoptic. In the fourth Gospel, Jesus revisits the Eleven a second time after eight days; and, therefore, the Ascension is here necessarily later still. In neither of these Gospels is there any account of an Ascension at all.

We may here point out that there is no mention of the Ascension in any of the genuine writings of Paul, and it would appear that the theory of a bodily Ascension, in any shape, did not form part of the oldest Christian tradition. The growth of the legend of the Ascension is apparent in the circumstance that the author of the third Gospel follows a second tradition regarding that event, when composing Acts. Whether he thought a fuller and more detailed account desirable, or it seemed necessary to prolong the period during which Jesus remained on earth after his Resurrection and to multiply his appearances, it is impossible to say; but the fact is that he does so. He states in his second work that to the Apostles Jesus "presented himself alive, after he suffered, by many proofs, being seen (ὀπτανόμενος) by them during forty days,

[1] Cf. Psalm cx. 1.

[2] The last phrase, "and was carried up into heaven," καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, is suspected by Griesbach, omitted by Tischendorf, and pronounced inauthentic by some critics. The words are not found in the *Sinaitic Codex* and D, but are in the great majority of the oldest MSS., including the *Alexandrian* and *Vatican*, C, E, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, etc. The preponderance of authority is greatly in their favour. Compare also Acts i. 2.

and speaking of the things concerning the Kingdom of God." It is scarcely possible to doubt that the period of forty days is suggested by the Old Testament and the Hebrew use of that number, of which, indeed, we already find examples in the New Testament in the forty days' temptation of Jesus in the wilderness,[1] and his fasting forty days and forty nights.[2] Why Jesus remained on earth this typical period we are not told,[3] but the representation evidently is of much more prolonged and continuous intercourse with his disciples than any statements in the Gospels have led us to suppose, or than the declaration of Paul renders in the least degree probable. If, indeed, the account in Acts were true, the numbered appearances recited by Paul show singular ignorance of the phenomena of the Resurrection.

We need not discuss the particulars of the last interview with the Apostles (i. 4 f.), although they are singular enough, and are indeed elsewhere referred to, but at once proceed to the final occurrences. Verse 9. "And when he had spoken these things, while they are looking he was lifted up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. 10. And as they were gazing stedfastly into the heaven as he went, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; 11. which also said: Men of Galilee (ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι), why stand ye looking into the heaven? This Jesus, who was taken up from you into the heaven, shall come in like manner as ye saw him going into the heaven. 12. Then returned they into Jerusalem," etc. A definite statement is here made of the mode in which Jesus finally ascended into heaven, and it presents some of the incongruities which might have been expected. The bodily Ascension up the sky in a cloud, apart from the miraculous nature of such an occurrence, seems singularly to localise "Heaven," and to present views of cosmical and celestial phenomena suitable certainly to the age of the writer, but which are not endorsed by modern science. The sudden appearance of the "two men in white apparel," the usual description of angels, is altogether in the style of the author of Acts, but does it increase the credibility of the story? It is curious that the angels open their address to the Apostles in the same form as almost every other speaker in this book. One might ask, indeed, why such an angelic interposition should have taken place? for its utility is not apparent, and in the short sentence recorded nothing which is new is embodied. No surprise is expressed at the appearance of the angels, and nothing is said of their disappearance. They are introduced, like the chorus of a Greek play, and are left

[1] Mark i. 13; Luke iv. 2. [2] Matt. iv. 2.

[3] The testimony of the Epistle of Barnabas (chapter xv.) does not agree with this.

unceremoniously, with an indifference which betrays complete familiarity with supernatural agency. Can there be any doubt that the whole episode is legendary?

It may not seem inappropriate to mention here that the idea of a bodily Ascension does not originate with the author of the third Synoptic and Acts, nor is it peculiar to Christianity. The translation of Enoch[1] had long been chronicled in the sacred books; and the ascent of Elijah[2] in his whirlwind and chariot of fire before the eyes of Elisha was another well-known instance. The vision of Daniel (vii. 13), of one like the "Son of man" coming with the clouds of heaven, might well have suggested the manner of his departure, but another mode has been suggested.[3] The author of Acts was, we maintain, well acquainted with the works of Josephus.[4] We know that the prophet like unto Moses was a favourite representation in Acts of the Christ. Now, in the account which Josephus gives of the end of Moses, he states that, although he wrote in the holy books that he died lest they should say that he went to God, this was not really his end. After reaching the mountain Abarim he dismissed the senate; and as he was about to embrace Eleazar, the high priest, and Joshua, "a cloud suddenly having stood over him he disappeared in a certain valley."[5] This we merely mention in passing.

Our earlier examination of the evidence for the origin and authorship of the historical books of the New Testament very clearly demonstrated that the testimony of these works for miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation, whatever that testimony might seem to be, could not be considered of any real value. We have now examined the accounts which the four Evangelists actually give of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, and there can be no hesitation in stating as the result that, as might have been expected from works of such uncertain character, these narratives must be pronounced mere legends, embodying vague and wholly unattested tradition. As evidence for such stupendous miracles they are absolutely of no value. No reliance can be placed on a single detail of their story. The aim of the writers

[1] Gen. v. 24; Ecclesiasticus xliv. 16, xlix. 14; Heb. xi. 5.

[2] 2 Kings ii. 11; Ecclesiasticus xlviii. 9, 11.

[3] Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 618.

[4] Cf. *Fortnightly Review*, 1877, p. 502 f.

[5] .....νέφους αἰφνίδιον ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν στάντος ἀφανίζεται κατά τινος φάραγγος. *Antiq. Jud.*, iv. 8, § 48.

has obviously been to make their narrative of the various appearances of Jesus as convincing as possible, and they have freely inserted any details which seemed to them calculated to give them impressiveness, force, and verisimilitude.

An apologetic writer has said: "Any one who will attentively read side by side the narratives of these appearances on the first day of the Resurrection will see that they have only been preserved for us in general, interblended and scattered notices (see Matt. xxviii. 16; Luke xxiv. 34; Acts i. 3), which, in strict exactness, render it impossible, without many arbitrary suppositions, to produce from them a *certain* narrative of the order of events. The *lacunæ*, the compressions, the variations, the actual differences, *the subjectivity of the narrators as affected by spiritual revelations*, render all harmonies at the best uncertain."[1] Passing over without comment the strange phrase in this passage which we have italicised, and which seems to claim divine inspiration for the writers, it must be obvious to any one who has carefully read the preceding pages that this is an exceedingly moderate description of the wild statements and irreconcilable contradictions of the different narratives we have examined. But, such as it is, with all the glaring inconsistencies and impossibilities of the accounts even thus subdued, is it possible for anyone who has formed even a faint idea of the extraordinary nature of the allegations which have to be attested to consider such documents really evidence for the Resurrection and bodily Ascension?

The usual pleas which are advanced in mitigation of judgment against the Gospels for these characteristics are of no avail. It may be easy to excuse the writers for their mutual contradictions, but the pleas themselves are an admission of the shortcomings which render their evidence valueless. "The differences of purpose in the narrative of the four Evangelists"[2] may be fancifully

[1] Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ii. 432, note 1.

[2] "Professor Westcott, with his usual profundity and insight, points out the differences of purpose in the narrative of the four Evangelists. St. Matthew dwells chiefly on the majesty and glory of the Resurrection; St. Mark, both in the original part and in the addition (Mark xvi. 9–20), insists upon it as *a fact;* St. Luke, as a *spiritual necessity;* St. John, as a touchstone of character (*Introd.*, 310–315)" (Farrar, *ib.*, ii. 432, note 1). Dr. Westcott says: "The various narratives of the Resurrection place the fragmentariness of the Gospel in the clearest light. They contain difficulties which it is impossible to explain with certainty, but there is no less an intelligible fitness and purpose in the details peculiar to each account.....It is necessary to repeat these obvious remarks, because the records of the Resurrection have given occasion to some of the worst examples of that kind of criticism from which the other parts of the Gospels have suffered, though not in an equal degree. It is tacitly assumed that we are in possession of all the circumstances of the event, and thus, on the one hand, differences are urged as fatal, and, on the other, elaborate attempts are made to show that the details given can be forced into

set forth, or ingeniously imagined, but no "purpose" can transform discordant and untrustworthy narratives into evidence for miracles. Unless the prologue to the third Gospel be considered a condemnation of any of the other Synoptics which we may have existed before it, none of the Evangelists makes the smallest reference to any of his brethren or their works. Each Gospel tacitly professes to be a perfectly independent work, giving the history of Jesus, or at least of the active part of his life, and of his death and Resurrection. The apologetic theory, derived from the Fathers, that the Evangelists designed to complete and supplement each other, is totally untenable. Each work was evidently intended to be complete in itself; but when we consider that much the greater part of the contents of each of the Synoptics is common to the three, frequently with almost literal agreement, and generally without sufficient alteration to conceal community of source or use of each other, the poverty of Christian tradition becomes painfully evident. We have already pointed out the fundamental difference between the fourth Gospel and the Synoptics. In no part of the history does greater contradiction and disagreement between the three Synoptics themselves, and likewise between them and the fourth Gospel, exist than in the account of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension. It is impossible to examine the four narratives carefully without feeling that here tradition, for natural reasons, has been more than usually wavering and insecure. Each writer differs essentially from the rest, and the various narratives not only disagree, but exclude each other. The third Synoptist, in the course of some years, even contradicts himself. The phenomena which are related, in fact, were too subjective and unsubstantial for sober and consistent narrative, and free play was allowed for pious imagination to frame details by the aid of supposed Messianic utterances of the Prophets and Psalmists of Israel.

Such a miracle as the Resurrection, startling as it is in our estimation, was commonplace enough in the view of these writers. We need not go back to discuss the story of the widow's son restored to life by Elijah,[1] nor that of the dead man who revived on touching the bones of Elisha.[2] The raising from the dead of the son of the widow of Nain[3] did not apparently produce much effect at the time, and only one of the Evangelists seems to have thought it worth while to preserve the narrative. The case of Jairus' daughter,[4] whatever it was, is regarded as a resurrection of

the semblance of a complete and connected narrative. The true critic will pause before he admits either extreme" (*Int. to the Study of the Gospels*, 4th ed., p. 329, 331).

[1] 1 Kings xvii. 17 f.
[2] 2 Kings xiii. 21.
[3] Luke vii. 11 f.
[4] Mark v. 35 f.; Luke viii. 46 f.

the dead, and is related by two of the Synoptists; but the raising of Lazarus is only recorded by the fourth Evangelist. The familiarity of the age with the idea of the resurrection of the dead, according to the Synoptists, is illustrated by the representation which they give of the effect produced by the fame of Jesus upon Herod and others. We are told by the first Synoptist that Herod said unto his servants: "This is John the Baptist; he was raised from the dead; and therefore the powers work in him."[1] The second Synoptist repeats the same statement, but adds: "But others said that it is Elijah; and others said that it is a prophet like one of the prophets."[2] The statement of the third Synoptist is somewhat different. He says: "Now Herod the tetrarch heard all that was occurring: and he was perplexed because it was said by some that John was raised from the dead, and by some that Elijah appeared, and by others that one of the old prophets rose up. And Herod said: John I beheaded, but who is this of whom I hear such things, and he sought to see him."[3] The three Synoptists substantially report the same thing; the close verbal agreement of the first two being an example of the community of matter of which we have just spoken. The variations are instructive as showing the process by which each writer made the original form his own. Are we to assume that these things were really said? Or must we conclude that the sayings are simply the creation of later tradition? In the latter case, we see how unreal and legendary are the Gospels. In the former, we learn how common was the belief in a bodily resurrection. How could it seem so strange to the Apostles that Jesus should rise again, when the idea that John the Baptist or one of the old prophets had risen from the dead was so readily accepted by Herod and others? How could they so totally misunderstand all that the chief priests, according to the first Synoptic, so well understood of the teaching of Jesus on the subject of his Resurrection, since the world had already become so familiar with the idea and the fact?

Then, the episode of the Transfiguration must have occurred to everyone, when Jesus took with him Peter and James and John into a high mountain apart, "and he was transfigured before them; and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment became white as the light. And behold, there was seen (ὤφθη) by them Moses and Elijah talking with him"; and then "a bright cloud overshadowed them" and "a voice came out of the cloud: This is my beloved son," etc. "And when the disciples heard they fell

[1] Matt. xiv. 2; cf. Mark vi. 14.
[2] Mark vi. 15.
[3] Luke ix. 7–9.

on their face and were sore afraid."[1] The third Synoptist even knows the subject of their conversation: "They were speaking of his decease which he was about to fulfil in Jerusalem."[2] This is related by all as an objective occurrence.[3] Are we to accept it as such? Then how is it possible that the disciples should be so obtuse and incredulous as they subsequently showed themselves to be regarding the person of Jesus and his Resurrection? How could the announcement of that event by the angels to the women seem to them as an idle tale, which they did not believe?[4] Here were Moses and Elijah before them, and in Jesus, we are told, they recognised one greater than Moses and Elijah. The miracle of the Resurrection was here again anticipated and made palpable to them. Are we to regard the Transfiguration as a subjective vision? Then why not equally so the appearances of Jesus after his passion? We can regard the Transfiguration, however, as nothing more than an allegory without either objective or subjective reality. Into this at present we cannot further go. It is sufficient to repeat that our examination has shown the Gospels to possess no value as evidence for the Resurrection and Ascension.

[1] Matt. xvii. 1 f.; cf. Mark ix. 2 f., Luke ix. 28 f. Nothing could be more instructive than a careful comparison of the three narratives of this occurrence and of the curious divergencies and amplifications of a common original introduced by successive editors.

[2] Luke ix. 31.

[3] We need not here speak of the use of the verb ὁράω.

[4] Luke xxiv. 11.

CHAPTER III.

THE EVIDENCE OF PAUL

We may now proceed to examine the evidence of Paul. "On one occasion," it is affirmed in a passage already quoted, "he gives a very circumstantial account of the testimony upon which the belief in the Resurrection rested (1 Cor. xv. 4–8)."[1] This account is as follows: 1 Cor. xv. 3. "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, 4. and that he was buried, and that he has been raised (ἐγήγερται) the third day according to the Scriptures, 5. and that he was seen by Cephas, then by the Twelve. 6. After that, he was seen by about five hundred brethren at once (ἐφάπαξ), of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. 7. After that, he was seen by James; then by all the Apostles. 8. And last of all he was seen by me also as the one born out of due time."[2] Can this be considered "a very circumstantial account"? It may be exceedingly unreasonable, but we must at once acknowledge that we are not satisfied. The testimony upon which belief in the Resurrection is said to rest is comprised in a dozen lines—for we may so far anticipate as to say that this cannot be regarded as a *résumé* of evidence which we can find elsewhere. We shall presently point out a few circumstances which it might be useful to know.

The Apostle states, in this passage, that the doctrines which he had delivered to the Corinthians he had himself "received." He does not pretend to teach them from his own knowledge, and the question naturally arises: From whom did he "receive" them? Formerly, divines generally taught that Paul received these doctrines by revelation, and up to recent times Apologists have continued to hold this view, even when admitting the subsidiary use of tradition. If this claim were seriously made, the statements of the Apostle, so far as our inquiry is concerned, would certainly not gain in value, for it is obvious that Revelation could not be admitted to prove Revelation. It is quite true that Paul himself professed to have received his Gospel not from men, but from God by direct revelation, and we shall hereafter have to consider this point and the inferences to be drawn from such pretensions. At present the

[1] Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 12. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 3.

argument need not be complicated by any such supposition, for certainly Paul does not here advance any such claim himself, and apologetic and other critics agree in declaring the source of his statements to be natural historical tradition. The points which he delivered, and which he had also received, are three in number: (1) that Christ died for our sins; (2) that he was buried; and (3) that he has been raised the third day. In strictness the καὶ ὅτι might oblige us to include, "and that he was seen by Cephas, then by the Twelve," after which the construction of the sentence is changed. It is not necessary to press this, however, and it is better for the present to separate the dogmatic statements from those which are more properly evidential.

It will be observed that, although the death, burial, and Resurrection are here taught as "received," evidence only of one point is offered: that Jesus "was seen by" certain persons. We have already pointed out that the Gospels do not pretend that any one was an eye-witness of the Resurrection itself, and it is important to notice that Paul, the earliest and most trustworthy witness produced, entirely passes over the event, and relies solely on the fact that Jesus was supposed to have been seen by certain persons to prove that he died, was buried, and had actually risen the third day. The only inference which we here wish to draw from this is, that the alleged appearances are thus obviously separated from the death and burial by a distinct gulf. A dead body, it is stated, or one believed to be dead, is laid in a sepulchre; after a certain time, it is alleged that the dead person has been seen alive. Supposing the first statement to be correct—of which there must, of course, be the most clear and detailed evidence—the second, being in itself, according to all our experience, utterly incredible, leaves further a serious gap in the continuity of evidence. What occurred in the interval between the burial and the supposed apparition? If it be asserted—as in the Gospels it is—that, before the apparition, the sepulchre was found empty and the body gone, the natural reply is that this very circumstance may have assisted in producing a subjective vision, but that, in so far as the disappearance of the body is connected with the appearance of the person apparently alive, the fact has no evidential value. The person supposed to be dead, for instance, may not have been actually so, but have revived; for, although we have no intention ourselves of adopting this explanation of the Resurrection, it is, as an alternative, certainly preferable to belief in the miracle. Or, in the interval, the body may have been removed from a temporary to a permanent resting-place, unknown to those who are surprised to find the body gone—and in the Gospels the conflicting accounts of the embalming and hasty burial, as we have seen, would fully permit of such an argument if we relied at all on those narratives.

Many other means of accounting for the absence of the body might be advanced, any one of which, in the actual default of testimony to the contrary, would be irrefutable. The mere surprise of finding a grave empty which was supposed to contain a body betrays a blank in the knowledge of the persons, which can only be naturally filled up. This gap, at least, would not have existed had the supposed resurrection occurred in the presence of those by whom it is asserted Jesus "was seen." As it is, no evidence whatever is offered that Jesus really died; no evidence that the sepulchre was even found empty; no evidence that the dead body actually rose and became alive again; but, skipping over the intermediate steps, the only evidence produced is the statement that, being supposed to be dead, he is said to have been seen by certain persons.[1]

There is a peculiarity in the statement to which we must now refer. The words, "according to the Scriptures" (*κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*) are twice introduced into the brief recapitulation of the teaching which Paul had received and delivered: (1) "That Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures," and (3) "that he has been raised the third day, according to the Scriptures." It is obvious that mere historical tradition has only to do with the fact "that Christ died," and that the object, "for our sins," is a dogmatic addition. The Scriptures supply the dogma. In the second point, the appeal to Scripture is curious, and so far important as indicating that the Resurrection on the third day was supposed to be a fulfilment of prophecy; and we have thus an indication, regarding which we must hereafter speak, of the manner in which the belief probably originated. The double reference to the Scriptures is peculiarly marked, and we have already more than once had occasion to point out that the narratives of the Gospels betray the very strong and constant influence of parts of the Old Testament supposed to relate to the Messiah. It cannot, we think, be doubted by any independent critic that the details of these narratives are largely due to the influence of the prophetic gnosis. It is natural to suppose that the early Christians, once accepting the idea of a suffering Messiah, should assume that prophecies which they believed to have reference to him had really been fulfilled, and that the actual occurrences corresponded minutely with the prophecies. It is probable that Christian tradition generally was moulded from foregone conclusions.

What were the "Scriptures," according to which "Christ died for our sins," and "has been raised the third day"? The passages which Paul most probably had in view were, as regards the death

[1] The curious account in Matt., xxviii. 1 f., of the earthquake and rolling away of the stone by an angel in the presence of the women, who nevertheless saw no Resurrection, will not be forgotten.

for our sins—Isaiah liii., Psalms xxii. and lxix., and for the Resurrection—Psalm xvi. 10 and Hosea vi. 2. We have already pointed out that historical criticism has shown that the first four passages just indicated are not Messianic prophecies at all, and we may repeat that the idea of a suffering Messiah was wholly foreign to the Jewish prophets and people. The Messiah "crucified," as Paul himself bears witness, was "to Jews a stumbling block,"[1] and modern criticism has clearly established that the parts of Scripture by which the early Christians endeavoured to show that such a Messiah had been foretold can only be applied by a perversion of the original signification. In the case of the passages supposed to foretell the Resurrection the misapplication is particularly flagrant. We have already discussed the use of Psalm xvi. 10, which in Acts[2] is put into the mouth of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and shown that the proof passage rests upon a mistranslation of the original in the Septuagint.[3] Any reader who will refer to Hosea vi. 2 will see that the passage in no way applies to the Messiah, although, undoubtedly, it has influenced the formation of the doctrine of the Resurrection. The "sign of the prophet Jonah," which, in Matt. xii. 40, is put into the mouth of Jesus, is another passage used with equal incorrectness; and a glimpse of the manner in which Christian tradition took shape, and the Gospels were composed, may be obtained by comparing with the words in the first Synoptic the parallel in the third (xi. 29–31).[4] We shall have more to say presently regarding the Resurrection "on the third day."

We may now proceed to examine the so-called "very circumstantial account of the testimony on which the belief in the Resurrection rested." "And that he was seen by Cephas, then by the Twelve. After that he was seen by above 500 brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that he was seen by James, then by all the Apostles, and last of all he was seen by me also."[5] There can be no doubt, we think, from the terms in which this statement is made, that Paul intended to give the appearances in chronological order. It would likewise be a fair inference that he intended to mention all the appearances of which he was aware. So far the account may possibly merit the epithet "circumstantial," but in all other respects it is scarcely possible to conceive any statement less circumstantial. As to where the risen Jesus was seen by these persons, in what manner, under what circumstances, and at what time, we are not vouchsafed a single particular. Moreover, the Apostle was not present on any

[1] 1 Cor. i. 23. [2] ii. 25 f., xiii. 35 f. [3] P. 82.
[4] Cf. Matt. xvi. 4; Mark viii. 11. [5] 1 Cor. xv. 5–8.

of these occasions, excepting, of course, his own vision, and, consequently, merely reports appearances of which he has been informed by others; but he omits to mention the authority upon which he makes these statements, or what steps he took to ascertain their accuracy and reality. For instance, when Jesus is said to have been seen by 500 brethren at once, it would have been of the highest importance for us to know the exact details of the scene, the proportion of inference to fact, the character of the Apostle's informant, the extent of the investigation into the various impressions made upon the individuals composing the 500, as opposed to the collective affirmation. We confess that we do not attach much value to such appeals to the experience of 500 persons at once. It is difficult to find out what the actual experience of the individuals was, and each person is so apt to catch the infection of his neighbour and join in excitement, believing that, though he does not himself see or feel anything, his neighbour does, that probably, when inquiry is pressed home, the aggregate affirmation of a large number may resolve itself into the actual experience of very few. The fact is, however, that in this "very circumstantial account" we have nothing except a mere catalogue by Paul, without a detail or information of any kind, of certain appearances which he did not himself see—always excepting his own vision, which we reserve—but merely had "received" from others. As evidence of the death and Resurrection it has no value.

If we compare these appearances with the instances recorded in the Gospels, the result is by no means satisfactory. The first appearance is said to be to Cephas. It is argued that Paul passes in silence over the appearances to women, both because the testimony of women was not received in Jewish courts, and because his own opinions regarding the active participation of women in matters connected with the Church were of a somewhat exclusive character.[1] The appearance to Cephas is generally identified with that mentioned, Luke xxiv. 34.[2] Nothing could be more cursory than the manner in which this appearance is related in the Synoptic. The disciples from Emmaus, returning at once to Jerusalem, found the Eleven and those who were with them saying: "The Lord was raised indeed, and was seen by Simon." Not another syllable is said regarding an appearance which, according to Paul, was the first which had occurred. The other Gospels say still less, for they ignore the incident altogether. It is difficult to find room for such an appearance in the Gospel narratives. If we take the

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 34 f.

[2] So Bisping, Maier, Meyer, Neander, Osiander, Rückert, Stanley, de Wette, etc.

report of Paul to be true, that Jesus was first seen by Cephas, the silence of three Evangelists and their contradictory representations, on the one hand, and the remarkable way in which the third Gospel avoids all but a mere indirect reference to the occurrence, on the other, are phenomena which we leave Apologists to explain.[1]

He is next seen "by the Twelve." This vision is identified with that narrated in John xx. 19 f. and Luke xxiv. 36 f.,[2] to which, as Thomas was absent on the first occasion, some critics understand the episode in John xx. 26 f. to be added. On reference to our discussion of these accounts, it will be seen that they have few or no elements of credibility. If the appearance to the Twelve mentioned by Paul be identified with these episodes, and their details be declared authentic, the second item in Paul's list becomes discredited.

The appearance to 500 brethren at once is not mentioned in any of the Gospels, but critics, and especially apologetic critics, assert with more or less of certainty the identity of the occasion with the scene described in Matt. xxviii. 16 f.[3] We remarked whilst discussing the passage that this is based chiefly on the statement that "some doubted," which would have been inconsistent, it is thought, had Jesus already appeared to the Eleven.[4] The identity is denied by others.[5] The narrative in the first Synoptic would scarcely add force to the report in the Epistle. Is it possible to suppose that, had there been so large a number of persons collected upon that occasion, the Evangelist would not have mentioned the fact? On the other hand, does it not somewhat discredit the statement that Jesus was seen by so large a number at once, that no record of such a remarkable occurrence exists elsewhere? How could the tradition of such an event, witnessed by so many, have so completely perished that neither in the Gospels nor Acts, nor in any other writing, is there any reference to it, and our only knowledge of it is this bare statement, without a single detail? There is only one explanation: that the

[1] Gfrörer thinks the germ of Paul's incident to lie in the statement John xx. 4 (*Die heil. Sage*, i., p. 376 f.). Dr. Farrar thinks the details "may have been of a nature too personal to have been revealed" (*Life of Christ*, ii., p. 437).

[2] So Bisping, Maier, Meyer, Neander, Osiander, Stanley, de Wette, etc.

[3] So Grotius, Maier, Osiander, Wordsworth, etc., ad l. Ebrard, *Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch.*, p. 591 f., 599; *zu Olsh. Leidensgesch.*, p. 210; Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ii., p. 445; cf. Olshausen, *Leidensgesch.*, p. 227; Stanley, *Corinthians*, p. 288.

[4] Beyschlag considers that, in these doubts, we have clearly an erroneous mixing up of the story of Thomas (John xx. 24 f.), and he thinks that probably in the incident of Jesus eating fish, described by the third Synoptic (xxiv. 42), we have a reminiscence of John xxi. 13 (*Stud. u. Kr.*, 1870, p. 218, anm).

[5] Alford, Bisping, Hofmann, Meyer, de Wette, etc.

assembly could not have recognised in the phenomenon, whatever it was, the risen Jesus, or that subsequently an explanation was given which dispelled some temporary illusion. In any case, we must insist that the total absence of all confirmation of an appearance to 500 persons at once renders such an occurrence more than suspicious. The statement that the greater number were still living when Paul wrote does not materially affect the question. Paul doubtless believed the report that such an appearance had taken place, and that the majority of witnesses still survived; but does it necessarily follow that the report was true? The survivors were certainly not within reach of the Corinthians, and could not easily be questioned. The whole of the argument of Paul which we are considering, as well as that which follows, was drawn from him by the fact that, in Corinth, Christians actually denied a Resurrection, and it is far from clear that this denial did not extend to denying the Resurrection of Jesus himself. That they did deny this we think certain, from the care with which Paul gives what he considers evidence for the fact. Another point may be mentioned. Where could so many as 500 disciples have been collected at one time? The author of Acts states (i. 15) the number of the Christian community gathered together to elect a successor to Judas as "about 120." Apologists, therefore, either suppose the appearance to 500 to have taken place in Jerusalem, when numbers of pilgrims from Galilee and other parts were in the Holy City, or that it occurred in Galilee itself, where they suppose believers to have been more numerous. This is the merest conjecture; and there is not even ground for asserting that there were so many as 500 brethren in any one place by whom Jesus could have been seen.

The appearance to James is not mentioned in any of our Gospels. Jerome preserves a legend from the Gospel of the Hebrews, which states that James, after having drunk the cup of the Lord, swore that he would not eat bread until he should see him risen from the dead. When Jesus rose, therefore, he appeared to James; and, ordering a table and bread to be brought, blessed and broke the bread, and gave it to James.[1] Beyond this legendary story there is no other record of the report given by Paul. The occasion on which he was seen by "all the Apostles" is indefinite, and cannot be identified with any account in the Gospels.

It is asserted, however, that, although Paul does not state from whom he "received" the report of these appearances of the risen Jesus, he must have heard them from the Apostles themselves. At any rate, it is added, Paul professes that his preaching on the

[1] Hieron., *De vir. ill.*, ii.

death, burial, and Resurrection is the same as that of the other Apostles.[1] That the other Apostles preached the Resurrection of Jesus may be a fact, but we have no information as to the precise statements they made. We shall presently discuss the doctrine from this point of view, but here we must confine ourselves to Paul. As for the inference that, associating with the Apostles, he must have been informed by them of the appearances of Jesus, we may say that this by no means follows so clearly as is supposed. Paul was singularly independent, and in his writings he directly disclaims all indebtedness to the elder Apostles. He claims that his Gospel is not after man, nor was it taught to him by man, but through revelation of Jesus Christ.[2] Now Paul himself informs us of his action after it pleased God to reveal his Son in him that he might preach him among the Gentiles. It might, indeed, have been reasonably expected that Paul should then have sought out those who could have informed him of all the extraordinary occurrences supposed to have taken place after the death of Jesus. Paul does nothing of the kind. He is apparently quite satisfied with his own convictions. "Immediately," he says, in his characteristic letter to the Galatians, "I communicated not with flesh and blood; neither went I away to Jerusalem to them who were Apostles before me, but I went away to Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then, after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, and abode with him fifteen days; but other of the Apostles saw I none, save James the brother of the Lord. Now the things which I write, behold before God I lie not.....Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem"[3]—upon which occasion, we know, his business was not of a nature to allow us to suppose that he obtained much information regarding the Resurrection.

We may ask: Is there that thirst for information regarding the facts and doctrines of Christianity displayed here, which entitles us to suppose that Paul eagerly and minutely investigated the evidence for them? We think not. Paul made up his own mind in his own way, and, having silently waited three years, it is not probable that the questions which he then asked were of any searching nature. The protest that he saw none of the other Apostles may prove his independence, but it certainly does not prove his anxiety for information. When Paul went up to make the acquaintance of Cephas his object clearly was not to be taught by him, but to place himself in communication with the man whom he believed to be the chief of the Apostles, and, we may assume, largely with a view to establish a friendly feeling, and secure recognition of his future ministry. We should not, of

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 11, 12. [2] Gal. i. 11, 12. [3] Gal. i. 16, 18, ii. 1.

course, be justified in affirming that the conversation between the two great Apostles never turned upon the subject of the Resurrection; but we think that it is obvious that Paul's visit was not in the least one of investigation. He believed; he believed that certain events had occurred "according to the Scriptures"; and the legitimate inference from Paul's own statements must be that, in this visit after three years, his purpose was in no way connected with a search for evidential information. The author of Acts, it will be remembered, represents him as, before any visit to Jerusalem, publicly and boldly preaching in Damascus that Jesus is the Son of God, and "confounding the Jews.....proving that this is the Christ."[1] This representation, it will be admitted, shows an advanced condition of belief little supporting the idea of subsequent investigation. When all conjectures are exhausted, however, we have the one distinct fact remaining that Paul gives no authority for his report that Jesus was seen by the various persons mentioned, nor does he furnish any means by which we can judge of the nature and reality of the alleged phenomena. We continue here to speak of the appearances to others, reserving the appearance to himself, as standing upon a different basis, for separate examination.

What is the value of this evidence? The fact to be proved is that, after a man had been crucified, dead, and buried, he actually rose from the dead, and appeared alive to many persons. The evidence is that Paul, writing some twenty years after the supposed miraculous occurrences, states, without detailed information of any kind, and without pretending to have himself been an eye-witness of the phenomena, that he has been told that Jesus was, after his death and burial, seen alive on the occasions mentioned! As to the Apostle Paul himself, let it be said in the most emphatic manner possible that we do not suggest the slightest suspicion of the sincerity of any historical statement he makes. We implicitly accept the historical statements, as distinguished from inferences, which proceed from his pen. It cannot be doubted that Paul was told that such appearances had been seen. We do not question the fact that he believed them to have taken place; and we shall hereafter discuss the weight to be attached to this circumstance. Does this, however, guarantee the truth of the reports or inferences of those who informed the Apostle? Does the mere passage of any story or tradition through Paul necessarily transmute error into truth—self-deception or hallucination into objective fact? Are we—without any information as to what was really stated to Paul, as to the personality and character of his informants, as to the details of what was believed to have occurred,

[1] Acts ix. 20, 22, 27.

as to the means taken to test the reality of the alleged phenomena, without an opportunity of judging for ourselves on a single point—to believe in the reality of these appearances simply because Paul states that he has been informed that they occurred, and himself believes the report?

So far as the belief of Paul is concerned, we may here remark that his views regarding the miraculous Charismata in the Church do not prepare us to feel any confidence in the sobriety of his judgment in connection with alleged supernatural occurrences. We have no reliance upon his instinctive mistrust of such statements, or his imperative requirement of evidence, but every reason to doubt them. On the other hand, without in any way imputing wilful incorrectness or untruth to the reporters of such phenomena, let it be remembered how important a part inference has to play in the narrative of every incident, and how easy it is to draw erroneous inferences from bare facts.[1] In proportion as persons are ignorant, on the one hand, and have their minds disturbed, on the other, by religious depression or excitement, hope, fear, or any other powerful emotion, they are liable to confound facts and inferences, and both to see and analyse wrongly. In the case of a supposed appearance alive of a person believed to be dead, it will scarcely be disputed, there are many disturbing elements, especially when that person has just died by a cruel and shameful death, and is believed to be the Messiah. The occurrence which we at any time see is, strictly speaking, merely a series of appearances, and the actual nature of the thing seen is determined in our minds by inferences. How often are these inferences correct? We venture to say that the greater part of the proverbial incorrectness and inaccuracy which prevail arise from the circumstance that inferences are not distinguished from facts, and are constantly erroneous. In that age, under such circumstances, and with Oriental temperaments, it is absolutely certain that there was exceptional liability to error; and the fact that Paul repeats the statements of unknown persons, dependent so materially upon inference, cannot possibly warrant us in believing them when they contradict known laws which express the results of universal experience. It is infinitely more probable that these persons were mistaken than that a dead man returned to life again, and

[1] We may merely in passing refer to the case of Mary Magdalene in the fourth Gospel. She sees a figure standing beside her, and infers that it is the gardener; presently something else occurs which leads her to infer that she was mistaken in her first inference, and to infer next that it is Jesus. It is a narrative upon which no serious argument can be based; but had she at first turned away, her first inference would have remained, and, according to the narrative, have been erroneous. We might also argue that, if further examination had taken place, her second inference might have proved as erroneous as the first is declared to have been.

appeared to them. We shall presently consider how much importance is to be attached to mere belief in the occurrence of such phenomena; but with regard to the appearances referred to by Paul, except in so far as they attest the fact that certain persons may have believed that Jesus appeared to them, such evidence has not the slightest value, and is indeed almost ludicrously insufficient to establish the reality of so stupendous a miracle as the Resurrection. It will have been observed that of the Ascension there is not a word—obviously for Paul the Resurrection and Ascension were one act.

Having so far discussed Paul's report that Jesus rose from the dead and was seen by others, we turn to his statement that, last of all, he was seen also by himself. In the former cases we have had to complain of the total absence of detailed information as to the circumstances under which he was supposed to have been seen; but it may be expected that, at least in his own case, we shall have full and minute particulars of so interesting and extraordinary a phenomenon. Here, again, we are disappointed. Paul does not give us a single detail. He tells us neither when, where, nor how he saw Jesus. It was all the more important that he should have entered into the particulars of this apparition, because there is one peculiarity in his case which requires notice. Whereas it may be supposed that in the other instances Jesus is represented as being seen immediately after the Resurrection and before his Ascension, the appearance to Paul must be placed years after that occurrence is alleged to have taken place. The question, therefore, arises: Was the appearance to Paul of the same character as the former? Paul evidently considers that it was. He uses the very same word when he says "he was seen (ὤφθη) by me," that he employs in stating that "he was seen (ὤφθη) by Cephas" and the rest, and he classes all the appearances together in precisely the same way. If, therefore, Paul knew anything of the nature of the appearances to the others, and yet considers them to have been of the same nature as his own, an accurate account of his own vision might have enabled us in some degree to estimate that of the others. Even without this account, it is something to know that Paul believed that there was no difference between the earlier and later appearances. And yet, if we reflect that in the appearances immediately after the Resurrection the representation is that Jesus possessed the very same body that had hung on the cross and been laid in the sepulchre, and that, according to the Gospels, he exhibited his wounds, allowed them to be touched, assured the disciples of his corporeality by permitting himself to be handled, and even by eating food in their presence, and that in the case of Paul the appearance took place years after Jesus is said to have ascended into heaven and sat down at the right hand of

God, the identity of the apparitions becomes a suggestive feature.

The testimony of Paul must at least override that of the Gospels, and, whatever may have been the vision of Paul, we may fairly assume that the vision of Peter and the rest was like it. Beyond this inference, Paul gives us no light with regard to the appearance of Jesus to himself. He merely affirms that Jesus did appear to him. "Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" he says in one place.[1] Elsewhere he relates: "But when he was pleased, who set me apart from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles; immediately, I communicated not with flesh and blood.....but I went away into Arabia and returned again unto Damascus."[2] Various opinions have been expressed regarding the rendering of ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί. The great majority of critics agree that the direct and natural sense must be adopted: "to reveal his Son in me," that is to say, "within me," "in my spirit."[3] Others maintain that ἐν ἐμοί must be rendered "through me,"[4] giving ἐν the sense of διά; but in that case the following context would be quite unnecessary. Hilgenfeld[5] thinks that the meaning is "in his person"; and Rückert and a few others read "to me." The liberties taken by interpreters of the New Testament with the preposition ἐν, too frequently from preconceived dogmatic reasons, are remarkable. The importance of this passage chiefly lies in the question whether the revelation here referred to is the same as the appearance to him of Jesus of the Corinthian letter. Some critics incline to the view that it is so,[6] whilst others consider that Paul does not thus speak of his vision, but rather of the doctrine concerning Jesus which formed his Gospel, and which Paul claimed to have received, not from man, but by revelation from God.[7] Upon this point we have only a few remarks to make. If it be understood that Paul refers to the appearance to him of Jesus, it is clear that he represents it in these

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 1. [2] Gal. i. 15–17.

[3] So Alford, Bisping, Ellicott, Ewald, Holtzmann, Jowett, Meyer, Olshausen, Schrader, Usteri, de Wette, Wieseler, Winer, Wordsworth, ad l.; Baur, *Paulus*, i., p. 75 f.; Holsten, *Zum Ev. Paulus, u. s. w.*, p. 42 f., anm.; Meijboom, *Jesus' Opstand.*, p. 105; Neander, *Pflanzung*, p. 117.

[4] Grotius, *Annot. in N. T.*, vi., p. 553; Baumgarten-Crusius, *Br. an die Gal.*, p. 26; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 82.

[5] *Der Galaterbr.*, p. 121.

[6] Baur, *Paulus*, i., p. 75 f.; Meijboom, *Jesus' Opstand.*, p. 105 f.; Jowett, *Eps. of St. Paul*, i., p. 216 f., 230 f.; Ewald, Holtzmann, Schrader, Usteri, Wieseler, etc., in l.

[7] Holsten, *Zum ev. Paul. u. s. w.*, p. 42, anm.; Neander, *Pflanzung*, p. 117; Alford, Bisping, Hilgenfeld, Lightfoot, Meyer, de Wette, Wordsworth, etc., in l.

words as a subjective vision, within his own consciousness. If, on the other hand, he do not refer to the appearance, then the passage loses all distinct reference to that occurrence. We do not intend to lay any further stress upon the expression than this, and it is fair to add that we do not think there is any special reference to the apparition of Jesus in the passage, but simply an allusion to his conversion to Christianity, which the Apostle considered a revelation in his mind of the true character and work of the Christ which had previously been so completely misunderstood by him. We may as well say at once that we desire to take the argument in its broadest form, without wasting time by showing that Paul himself uses language which seems to indicate that he recognised the appearance of Jesus to have been merely subjective. The only other passage which we need now mention is the account which Paul gives, 2 Cor. xii. 2 f., of his being caught up to the third heaven. A few critics consider that this may be the occasion on which Jesus appeared to him, to which he refers in the passage of the former letter which we are considering;[1] but the great majority are opposed to the supposition. In any case there is no evidence that the occasions are identical, and we therefore are not entitled to assume that they are so.

It will have been observed that we have hitherto confined our attention wholly to the undoubted writings of Paul. Were there no other reason than the simple fact that we are examining the evidence of Paul himself, and have, therefore, to do with that evidence alone, we should be thoroughly justified in this course. It is difficult to clear the mind of statements regarding Paul and his conversion which are made in the Acts of the Apostles, but it is absolutely essential that we should understand clearly what Paul himself tells us and what he does not tell us, for the present totally excluding Acts. What, then, does Paul himself tell us of the circumstances under which he saw Jesus? Absolutely nothing. The whole of his evidence for the Resurrection consists in the bare statement that he did see Jesus. Now, can the fact that any man merely affirms, without even stating the circumstances, that a person once actually dead and buried has risen from the dead and been seen by him, be seriously considered satisfactory evidence for so astounding a miracle? Is it possible for anyone of sober mind, acquainted with the nature of the proposition, on the one hand, and with the innumerable possibilities of error, on the other, to regard such an affirmation even as evidence of much importance in such a matter? We venture to say that, in such a case, an affirmation of this nature, even made by a man of high character and ability, would possess little weight. If the person making it,

[1] Dr. Jowett thinks this not improbable (*The Epistles of St. Paul*, i., p. 229).

although of the highest honour, were known to suppose himself the subject of constant revelations and visions, and if, perhaps, he had a constitutional tendency to nervous excitement and ecstatic trance, his evidence would have no weight at all. We shall presently have to speak of this more in detail in connection with Paul. Such an allegation, even supported by the fullest information and most circumstantial statement, could not establish the reality of the miracle; without them, it has no claim to belief. What is the value of a person's testimony who simply makes an affirmation of some important matter, unaccompanied by particulars, and the truth of which cannot be subjected to the test of even the slightest cross-examination? It is worth nothing. It would not be received at all in a Court of Justice. If we knew the whole of the circumstances of the apparition to Paul, from which he inferred that he had seen the risen Jesus, the natural explanation of the supposed miracle might be easy. We have only the bare report of a man who states that he had seen Jesus, unconfirmed by any witnesses. Under no circumstances could isolated evidence like this be of much value. The facts and inferences are alike without corroboration, but on the other hand are contradicted by universal experience.

When we analyse the evidence, it is reduced to this: Paul believed that he had seen Jesus. This belief constitutes the whole of Paul's evidence for the Resurrection. It is usual to argue that the powerful effect which this belief produced upon his life and teaching renders it of extraordinary force as testimony. This we are not prepared to admit. If the assertion that Jesus appeared to him had not been believed by Paul, it would not have secured a moment's attention. That this conviction affected his life was the inevitable consequence of such belief. Paul eminently combined works with faith in his own life. When he believed Jesus to be an impostor, he did not content himself with sneering at human credulity, but vigorously persecuted his followers. When he came to believe Jesus to be the Messiah, he was not more inactive, but became the irrepressible Apostle of the Gentiles. He acted upon his convictions in both cases; but his persecution of Christianity no more proved Jesus to be an impostor than his preaching of Christianity proved Jesus to be the Messiah. It only proved that he believed so. He was as earnest in the one case as in the other. We repeat, therefore, that the evidence of Paul for the Resurrection amounts to nothing more than the belief that Jesus had been seen by him. We shall presently further examine the value of this belief as evidence for so astounding a miracle.

We must not form exaggerated conceptions of the effect upon Paul of the appearance to him of Jesus. That his convictions and

views of Christianity were based upon the reality of the Resurrection is undeniable; and that they received powerful confirmation and impulse through his vision of Jesus is also not to be doubted; but let us clear our minds of representations derived from other sources, and understand what Paul himself does and does not say of this vision; and for this purpose we must confine ourselves to the undoubted writings of the Apostle. Does Paul himself ascribe his conversion to Christianity to the fact of his having seen Jesus? Most certainly not. That is a notion derived solely from the statements in Acts. The sudden and miraculous conversion of Paul is a product of the same pen which produced the story of the sudden conversion of the thief on the cross—an episode equally unknown to other writers. Paul neither says when nor where he saw Jesus. The revelation of God's Son in him not being an allusion to this vision of Jesus, but merely a reference to the light which dawned upon Paul's mind as to the character and mission of Jesus, there is no ground whatever, from the writings of the Apostle himself, to connect the appearance of Jesus with his conversion. The statement in the Epistle to the Galatians simply amounts to this: When it pleased him who elected him from his mother's womb, and called him by his grace, to reveal to his mind the truth concerning his Son, that he might preach him among the Gentiles, he communicated not with flesh and blood, neither did he go up to Jerusalem to those who were Apostles before him, but immediately went away to Arabia, and after that returned again to Damascus. It can scarcely be doubted that Paul here refers to his change of views—to his conversion—but as little can it be doubted that he does not ascribe that conversion to the appearance to him of Jesus spoken of in the Corinthian letter.

Let any reader who honestly desires to ascertain the exact position of the case ask himself the simple question whether, supposing the Acts of the Apostles never to have existed, it is possible to deduce from this, or any other statement of Paul, that he actually ascribes his conversion to the fact that Jesus appeared to him in a supernatural manner. He may possibly in some degree base his apostolic claims upon that appearance, although it may be doubted how far he does even this; if he did so, it would only prove the reality of his belief, but not the reality of the vision; but there is no evidence whatever in the writings of Paul that he connected his conversion with the appearance of Jesus. All that we can legitimately infer seems to be that, before his adoption of Christianity, he had persecuted the Church;[1] and further it may be gathered from the passage in the Galatian letter that at the time when this change occurred he was at Damascus. At least he

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 9.

says that from Arabia he "returned again to Damascus," which seems to imply that he first went from that city to Arabia. When we consider the expressions in the two letters, it becomes apparent that Paul does not set forth any instantaneous conversion of the character related elsewhere. To the Galatians he describes his election from his mother's womb and call by the grace of God as antecedent to the revelation of his Son in him: "When he who separated me from my mother's womb and called me by his grace was pleased to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles," etc. And if the reading "through me" be adopted, the sense we are pointing out becomes still more apparent. In the Corinthian letter again, the expressions should be remarked: Verse 8. "And last of all he was seen by me also, as the one born out of due time. 9. For I am the least of the Apostles, that am not fit to be called an Apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God; 10. but by the grace of God I am what I am: and his grace which was (bestowed) upon me was not in vain, but I laboured more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God with me. 11. Whether, therefore, it were I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed."[1] Peter sees Jesus first, Paul sees him last; and as the thought uppermost in his mind in writing this Epistle was the parties in the Corinthian Church, and the opposition to himself and denial even of his Apostleship, the mention of his having seen Jesus immediately leads him to speak of his apostolic claims. "Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" he had just before exclaimed, and proceeded to defend himself against his opponents: here, again, he reverts to the same subject, with proud humility calling himself, on the one hand, "the least of the Apostles," but, on the other, asserting that he had "laboured more abundantly than they all." He is led to contrast his past life with his present; the time when he persecuted the Church with that in which he built it up. There is, however, no allusion to any miraculous conversion when he says, "by the grace of God I am what I am." He may consider his having seen the Lord and become a witness of his resurrection one part of his qualification for the Apostolate, but assuredly he does not represent this as the means of his conversion.

We shall not pause to discuss at length how far being a witness for the Resurrection really was made a necessary qualification for the apostolic office. The passages, Luke xxiv. 48, Acts i. 22, ii. 32, upon which the theory mainly rests, are not evidence of the fact which can for a moment be accepted. It is obvious that the Twelve were Apostles from having been chosen disciples of the Master from the commencement of his active career, and not from

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 8.

any fortuitous circumstance at its close. If Paul says, "Am I not an Apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" he continues: "Are ye not my work in the Lord? If I am not an Apostle unto others, yet I am at least to you: for the seal of mine Apostleship are ye in the Lord. My defence to them that examine me is this."[1] There can be no doubt that the claims of Paul to the Apostolate were, during his life, constantly denied, and his authority rejected. As we have elsewhere pointed out, there is no evidence that his Apostleship was ever recognised by the elder Apostles, nor that his claim was ever submitted to them. Even in the second century the *Clementine Homilies* deny him the honour, and make light of his visions and revelations. All the evidence we possess shows that Paul's vision of Jesus did not secure for him much consideration in his own time - a circumstance which certainly does not tend to establish its reality.

What weight can we, then, attach to the representation in the Acts of the Apostles of the conversion of Paul? Our examination of that work has sufficiently shown that none of its statements can be received as historical. Where we have been able to compare them with the Epistles of Paul, they have not been in agreement. Nothing could be more obvious than the contradiction between the narrative of Paul's conduct after his conversion, according to Acts, and the account which Paul gives in the Galatian letter. We need not repeat the demonstration here. Where we possess the means of comparison we discover the inaccuracy of Acts. Why should we suppose that which we cannot compare more accurate? So far as our argument is concerned, it matters very little whether we exclude the narrative of the conversion of Acts or not. We point out, however, that there is no confirmation whatever in the writings of Paul of the representation of his conversion by means of a vision of Jesus, which, upon all considerations, may much more reasonably be assigned to a somewhat later period. If we ventured to conjecture, we should say that the author of Acts has expanded the scattered sayings of Paul into this narrative, making the miraculous conversion by a personal interposition of Jesus, which he therefore relates no less than three times, counterbalance the disadvantage of his not having followed Jesus in the flesh. It is curious that he has introduced the bare statement into the third Synoptic, that Jesus "was seen by Simon" (ὤφθη Σίμωνι),[2] which none of the other Evangelists mentions, but which he may have found, without further particulars, ὤφθη Κηφᾷ, in the Epistle whence he derived, perhaps, materials for the other story. In no case can the narrative in Acts be received as evidence of the slightest value; but in order not

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 1–3. [2] Luke xxiv. 34.

to pass over even such statements in silence, we shall very briefly examine it.

The narrative is repeated thrice: in the first instance (ix. 1 f.) as a historical account of the transaction; next (xxii. 4 f.) introduced into a speech supposed to be delivered by Paul to the Jews when taken prisoner in consequence of their uproar on finding him in the Temple purifying himself with the four men who had a vow—a position which cannot historically be reconciled with the character and views of Paul; and, thirdly, again put into the mouth of the Apostle (xxvi. 9 f.) when he pleads his cause before King Agrippa. Paul is represented in the headlong career of persecuting the Church, and going with letters from the high priest empowering him to bring Christian men and women bound unto Jerusalem. "And as he journeyed, it came to pass that he drew nigh to Damascus, and suddenly there shone round about him a light out of the heaven, and he fell upon the earth and heard a voice saying unto him: Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. But rise and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do."[1] In the second account there is so far no very wide discrepancy, but there, as in the third, the time is said to be about noon. There is a very considerable difference in the third account, however, more especially in the report of what is said by the voice: xxvi. 13. "At mid-day, O King, I saw in the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun, shining round about me and those journeying with me; 14. and when we all fell to the earth, I heard a voice saying unto me in the Hebrew tongue: Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? it is hard for thee to kick against pricks. 15. And I said: Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said: I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. 16. But rise and stand upon thy feet; for I was seen by thee for this purpose, to choose thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou sawest, and of the things in which I will appear unto thee; 17. delivering thee from the people and from the Gentiles, unto whom I send thee; 18. to open their eyes, that they may turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and a lot among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me."[2]

It will be admitted that this address is widely different from that reported in the two earlier accounts. Apologists argue that in this third narrative Paul has simply transferred from Ananias to Jesus the message delivered to him by the former, according to the second account. Let us first see what Ananias is there represented as saying. Acts xxii. 14: "And he said: The God of our

[1] Acts ix. 3; cf. xxii. 6–8, 10.

[2] Acts. xxvi. 13.

fathers chose thee, to know his will and to see the Righteous One;[1] 15. for thou shalt be a witness to him unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard."[2] Now, Paul clearly professes in the speech which he is represented as delivering before Agrippa to state what the voice said to him: "And he said," "and I said," "and he said," distinctly convey the meaning that the report is to be what was actually said. If the sense of what Ananias said to him is embodied in part of the address ascribed to the voice, it is strangely altered and put into the first person; but, beyond this, there is much added which appears neither in the speech of Ananias nor anywhere else in any of the narratives. If we further compare the instructions given to Ananias in the vision of the first narrative with his words in the second and those ascribed to the voice in the third, we shall see that these again differ very materially. Acts ix. 15. "But the Lord said unto him: Go; for this man is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before Gentiles and kings, and the sons of Israel: 16. For I will show him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake."[3] What must we think of a writer who deals so freely with his materials, and takes such liberties even with so serious a matter as this heavenly vision and the words of the glorified Jesus?

In the third account Jesus is represented as saying: "It is hard for thee to kick against pricks."[4] This is a well-known proverbial saying, frequently used by classical Greek and Latin authors,[5] and not altogether strange to Hebrew. It is a singularly anthropomorphic representation to put such a saying into the mouth of the divine apparition, and it assists in betraying the mundane origin of the whole scene. Another point deserving consideration is that Paul is not told what he is to do by the voice of Jesus, but is desired to go into the city to be there instructed by Ananias. This is clearly opposed to Paul's own repeated asseverations. "For neither did I receive it from man nor was taught it, but through a revelation of Jesus Christ,"[6] is his statement. The details of the incident itself, moreover, are differently stated in the various accounts, and cannot be reconciled. According to the first account, the companions of Paul "stood speechless"

[1] It will be remembered that this epithet occurs in Acts iii. 14, vii. 52, and nowhere else in the New Testament.

[2] Acts xxii. 14. [3] *Ib.*, ix. 15.

[4] xxvi. 14. This phrase was introduced into Acts ix. 5 of the Authorised Version by Erasmus from the Vulgate; but it is not found there in any Greek MS. of the slightest authority.

[5] Cf. Æsch., *Prom.*, 323; *Agamem.*, 1633; Eurip., *Bacch.*, 791; Pindar., *Pyth.*, ii. 173; Terent., *Phorm.*, i. 2, 27; Plaut., *Truc.*, iv. 2, 59. Baumgarten, Beelen, Grotius, Hackett, Humphrey, Kuinoel, Meyer, Olshausen, Overbeck, Wetstein, De Wette, Wordsworth, etc., in l. Zeller, *Apg.*, p. 193, anm. 1.

[6] Gal. i. 11 f.

(ix. 7); in the third, they "all fell to the earth" (xxvi. 14). The explanation that they first fell to the ground and then rose up fails satisfactorily to harmonise the two statements; as does likewise the suggestion that the first expression is simply an idiomatic mode of saying that they were speechless, independent of position. Then again, in the first account, it is said that the men stood speechless, "hearing the voice (ἀκούοντες τῆς φωνῆς), but seeing no one."[1] In the second we are told: "And they that were with me saw indeed the light; but they heard not the voice (τὴν φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν) of him speaking to me."[2] No two statements could be more contradictory. The attempt to reconcile them by explaining the verb ἀκούω in the one place "to hear" and in the other "to understand" is inadmissible, because wholly arbitrary. It is quite obvious that the word is used in the same sense in both passages, the difference being merely the negative. In the third account the voice is described as speaking "in the Hebrew tongue,"[3] which was probably the native tongue of the companions of Paul from Jerusalem. If they heard the voice speaking Hebrew, they must have understood it. The effort to make the vision clearly objective, and, at the same time, to confine it to Paul, leads to these complications. The voice is heard, though the speaker is not seen, by the men in the one story, whilst the light is seen and the voice not heard in the other, and yet it speaks in Hebrew according to the third, and even makes use of classical proverbs, and uses language wondrously similar to that of the author of Acts.

We may remark here that Paul's Gospel was certainly not revealed to him upon this occasion; and, therefore, the expressions in his Epistles upon this subject must be referred to other revelations. There is, however, another curious point to be observed. Paul is not described as having actually seen Jesus in the vision. According to the first two accounts, a light shines round about him, and he falls to the ground and hears a voice; when he rises he is blind.[4] If, in the third account, he sees the light from heaven above the brightness of the sun shining round about him and his companions,[5] they equally see it according to the second account.[6] The blindness, therefore, is miraculous and symbolic, for the men are not blinded by the light.[7] It is singular that Paul nowhere refers to this blindness in his letters. It cannot be doubted that the writer's purpose is to symbolise the very change from darkness to light, in the case of Paul, which, after Old Testament prophecies, is referred to in the words ascribed, in the third account,[8] to the voice. Paul, thus, only sees the

[1] Acts ix. 7. [2] *Ib.*, xxii. 9. [3] *Ib.*, xxvi. 14.
[4] Acts ix. 3, 4, 8, xxii. 6, 7, 11. [5] xxvi. 13.
[6] xxii. 9. [7] xxii. 11 does not refute this. [8] xxvi. 18.

light which surrounds the glorified Jesus, but not his own person, and the identification proceeds only from the statement: "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." It is true that the expression is strangely put into the mouth of Jesus, in the third account: "for I was seen by thee (ὤφθην σοι) for this purpose," etc.;[1] but the narrative excludes the actual sight of the speaker, and it is scarcely possible to read the words just quoted, and their context, without being struck by their incongruity. We need not indicate the sources of this representation of light shrouding the heavenly vision, so common in the Old Testament. Before proceeding to the rest of the account, we may point out in passing the similarity of the details of this scene to the vision of Daniel x. 7–9.

Returning to the first narrative, we are told that, about the same time as this miracle was occurring to Paul, a supernatural communication was being made to Ananias in Damascus: ix. 10. "And to him said the Lord in a vision: Ananias. And he said, Behold I am here, Lord. 11. And the Lord said unto him: Rise and go to the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul, of Tarsus; for, behold he prayeth; 12. and he saw a man named Ananias, who came in and put his hand on him that he might receive sight. 13. But Ananias answered, Lord, I heard from many concerning this man, how much evil he did to thy saints in Jerusalem: 14. And here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on thy name. 15. But the Lord said, Go, etc. (quoted above). 17. And Ananias went away, and entered into the house; and having put his hands on him said: Brother Saul, the Lord hath sent me, even Jesus that appeared unto thee in the way by which thou camest, that thou mightest receive sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit. 18. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it were scales; and he received sight, rose up, and was baptised, and having taken food was strengthened." We have already had occasion to point out, in connection with the parallelism kept up in Acts between the Apostle of the Gentiles and the Apostle of the Circumcision, that a similar double vision is narrated by the author as occurring to Peter and Cornelius. Some further vision is referred to in v. 12; for in no form of the narrative of Paul's vision on the way to Damascus is he represented as seeing a man named Ananias coming to him for the purpose described. Many questions are suggested by the story just quoted. How did Ananias know that Paul had authority from the chief priests to arrest any one? How could he argue in such a way with the Lord? Did he not then know that Jesus had appeared to Paul on the way? How did he get

[1] xxvi. 16.

that information? Is it not an extraordinary thing that Paul never mentions Ananias in any of his letters, nor in any way alludes to these miracles? We have already referred to the symbolic nature of the blindness and recovery of sight on receiving the Holy Spirit and being baptised, and this is rendered still more apparent by the statement: v. 9. "And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink."

We may further point out that in immediate connection with this episode Paul is represented, in the second account, as stating that, on going to Jerusalem, he has another vision of Jesus: xxii. 17. "And it came to pass that, when I returned to Jerusalem and was praying in the Temple, I was in a trance, 18. and saw him saying unto me: Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem; for they will not receive thy witness concerning me. 19. And I said: Lord, they themselves know that I was wont to imprison and beat in every synagogue them that believe on thee. 20. And when the blood of Stephen, thy witness, was shed, I also was standing by and consenting, and keeping the garments of them that slew him. 21. And he said unto me: Go, for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles." It seems impossible, considering the utter silence of Paul, that the apparition to which he refers can have spoken to him as described upon these occasions. We have elsewhere remarked that there is not the slightest evidence in his own or other writings connecting Stephen with Paul, and it may be appropriate to add here that, supposing him to have been present when the martyr exclaimed, "Lo, I behold the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God,"[1] it is singular that he does not name him as one of those by whom Jesus "was seen."

To resume this discussion, however: we have already shown that the statements of the Acts regarding Paul's conduct after this alleged vision are distinctly in contradiction with the statements of Paul. The explanation here given of the cause of Paul's leaving Jerusalem, moreover, is not in agreement with Acts ix. 29 f., and much less with Gal. i. 20 f. The three narratives themselves are full of irreconcilable differences and incongruities, which destroy all reasonable confidence in any substantial basis for the story. It is evident that the three narratives are from the same pen, and betray the composition of the author of Acts. They cannot be regarded as true history. The hand of the composer is very apparent in the lavish use of the miraculous, so characteristic of the whole work. Such a narrative cannot be received in evidence.

The whole of the testimony before us, then, simply amounts to this: Paul believed that he had seen Jesus some years after his

[1] vii. 56.

death; there is no evidence that he ever saw him during his life. He states that he had "received" that he was seen by various other persons, but he does not give the slightest information as to who told him, or what reasons he had for believing the statements to be correct; and still less does he narrate the particulars of the alleged appearances, or even of his own vision. Although we have no detailed statements of these extraordinary phenomena, we may assume that, as Paul himself believed that he had seen Jesus, certain other people of the circle of his disciples likewise believed that they had seen the risen Master. The whole of the evidence for the Resurrection reduces itself to an undefined belief on the part of a few persons, in a notoriously superstitious age, that after Jesus had died and been buried they had seen him alive. These visions, it is admitted, occurred at a time of the most intense religious excitement, and under circumstances of wholly exceptional mental agitation and distress. The wildest alternations of fear, doubt, hope, and indefinite expectation added their effects to oriental imaginations already excited by indignation at the fate of their Master, and sorrow or despair at such a dissipation of their Messianic dreams. There was present every element of intellectual and moral disturbance. Now, must we seriously ask again whether this bare and wholly unjustified belief can be accepted as satisfactory evidence for so astounding a miracle as the Resurrection? Can the belief of such men, in such an age, establish the reality of a phenomenon which contradicts universal experience? It comes to us in the form of bare belief from the Age of Miracles, unsupported by facts, uncorroborated by evidence, unaccompanied by proof of investigation, and unprovided with material for examination. What is such belief worth? We have no hesitation in saying that it is absolutely worth nothing.

We might here well bring our inquiry to a close, for we have no further evidence to deal with. The problem, however, is so full of interest that we cannot yet lay it down, and although we must restrain our argument within certain rigid limits, and wholly refrain from entering into regions of mere speculation, we may further discuss the origin and nature of the belief in the Resurrection. Recognising the fact that, although its nature and extent are very indefinite, there existed an undoubted belief that after his death Jesus was seen alive, the argument is advanced that there must have been a real basis for this belief. "The existence of a Christian society," says an apologetic writer, "is the first and (if rightly viewed) the final proof of the historic truth of the miracle on which it was founded. It may, indeed, be said that the Church

was founded upon the belief in the Resurrection, and not upon the Resurrection itself; and that the testimony must therefore be limited to the attestation of the belief, and cannot reach to the attestation of the fact. But belief expressed in action is for the most part the strongest evidence which we can have of any historic event. Unless, therefore, it can be shown that the origin of the apostolic belief in the Resurrection, with due regard to the fulness of its characteristic form and the breadth and rapidity of its propagation, can be satisfactorily explained on other grounds, the belief itself is a sufficient proof of the fact."[1] This is obviously Paley's argument of the Twelve men[2] in a condensed form. Belief in action may be the strongest evidence which we can have of any historic event; but when the historic event happens to be an event in religious history, and an astounding miracle like the Resurrection, such bare evidence, emanating from such an age, is no evidence at all. The breadth and rapidity of its propagation absolutely prove nothing but belief in the report of those who believed; although it is very far from evident that people embraced Christianity from a rational belief in the Resurrection. No one pretends that the Gentiles who believed made a preliminary examination of the truth of the Resurrection. If breadth and rapidity of propagation be taken as sufficient proof of the truth of facts, we might consider Buddhism and Mohammedanism as satisfactorily attested creeds. There could not be a greater fallacy than the supposition that the origin of a belief must be explained upon other grounds, or that belief itself accepted as a sufficient proof of the fact asserted. The truth or falsehood of any allegation is determined by a balance of evidence, and the critic is no more bound to account for the formation of erroneous belief than he is bound to believe because he may not, after a great lapse of time, be able so clearly to demonstrate the particular manner in which that erroneous belief originated, that any other mode is definitely excluded. The allegation that a dead man rose from the dead and appeared to several persons alive is contrary to universal experience; but, on the other hand, the prevalence of defective observation, mistaken inference, self-deception, and credulity, any of which might lead to such belief, are only too much in accordance with it. Is it necessary to define which peculiar form of error is present in every false belief before, with this immense preponderance of evidence against it, we finally reject it? We think not. Any explanation consistent with universal experience must be adopted, rather than a belief which is contradictory to it.

There are two theories which have been advanced to explain

[1] Westcott, *The Gospel of the Resurrection*, 3rd ed., p. 106 f.

[2] *Evidences and Horæ Paulinæ*, ed. Potts, 1850, p. 6.

the origin of the Apostolic belief in the Resurrection, to which we may now briefly refer; but it must be clearly understood that the suggestion of an explanation is quite apart from our examination of the actual evidence for the Resurrection. Fifty explanations might be offered, and be considered unsatisfactory, without in the least degree altering the fact that the testimony for the final miracle of Christianity is totally insufficient, and that the allegation that it actually occurred cannot be maintained. The first explanation, adopted by some able critics, is that Jesus did not really die on the cross, but, being taken down alive, and his body being delivered to friends, he subsequently revived. In support of this theory, it is argued that Jesus is represented by the Gospels as expiring after having been but three to six hours upon the cross, which would have been an unprecedentedly rapid death. It is affirmed that only the hands and not the feet were nailed to the cross. The crurifragium, not usually accompanying crucifixion, is dismissed as unknown to the three Synoptists, and only inserted by the fourth Evangelist for dogmatic reasons; and of course the lance-thrust disappears with the leg-breaking. Thus the apparent death was that profound faintness which might well fall upon such an organisation after some hours of physical and mental agony on the cross, following the continued strain and fatigue of the previous night. As soon as he had sufficiently recovered, it is supposed that Jesus visited his disciples a few times to re-assure them, but with precaution on account of the Jews, and was by them believed to have risen from the dead, as indeed he himself may likewise have supposed, reviving as he had done from the faintness of death.[1] Seeing, however, that his death had set the crown upon his work, the Master withdrew into impenetrable obscurity, and was heard of no more.

We have given but the baldest outline of this theory; for it would occupy too much space to represent it adequately and show

[1] Gfrörer, who maintains the theory of a Scheintod with great ability, thinks that Jesus had believers amongst the rulers of the Jews, who, although they could not shield him from the opposition against him, still hoped to save him from death. Joseph, *a rich man*, found the means of doing so. He prepared the new sepulchre close to the place of execution, to be at hand—begged the body from Pilate—the immense quantity of spices bought by Nicodemus being merely to distract the attention of the Jews—and Jesus, being quickly carried to the sepulchre, was restored to life by their efforts. He interprets the famous verse, John xx. 17, curiously. The expression, "I have not yet ascended to my Father and your Father," etc., he takes as meaning simply the act of dying—"going to heaven"; and the reply of Jesus is equivalent to: "Touch me not, for I am still flesh and blood—I am not yet dead." Jesus sees his disciples only a few times mysteriously, and, believing that he had set the final seal to the truth of his work by his death, he then retires into impenetrable gloom (*Das Heiligthum und die Wahrheit*, p. 107 f., p. 231 f.).

the ingenuity with which it is worked out, and the very considerable support which it receives from statements in the Gospels, and from inferences deducible from them. We do not ourselves adopt this explanation, although it must be clearly repeated that, were the only alternative to do so or to fall back upon the hypothesis of a miracle, we should consider it preferable. A serious objection brought against the theory seems to be that it is not natural to suppose that, after such intense and protracted fatigue and anxiety, followed by the most cruel agony on the cross, agony both of soul and body,[1] ending in unconsciousness only short of death, Jesus could within a short period have presented himself to his disciples with such an aspect as could have conveyed to them the impression of victory over death by the Prince of Life. He must still, it is urged, have presented the fresh traces of suffering and weakness little calculated to inspire them with the idea of divine power and glory. This is partly, but not altogether, true. There is no evidence, as we shall presently show, that the appearances of Jesus occurred so soon as is generally represented; and, in their astonishment at again seeing the Master whom they supposed to be dead, the disciples could not have been in a state minutely to remark the signs of suffering,[2] then probably, with the power of a mind like that of Jesus over physical weakness, little apparent. Time and imagination would doubtless soon have effaced from their minds any such impressions, and left only the belief that he had risen from the dead to develop and form the Christian doctrine. A more powerful objection seems to us the disappearance of Jesus. We cannot easily persuade ourselves that such a teacher could have renounced his work and left no subsequent trace of his existence. Still, it must be admitted that many explanations might be offered on this head, the most obvious being that death, whether as the result of the terrible crisis through which he had passed or from some other cause, may soon after have ensued. We repeat, however, that we neither advance this explanation nor think it worth while to discuss it seriously, not because we think it untenable, although we do not adopt it, but because we consider that there is another explanation of the origin of belief in the Resurrection which is better, and which is, in our opinion, the true one. We mean that which is usually called the "vision hypothesis."

[1] Holsten remarks that the cry put into the mouth of Jesus on the Cross, in the first and second Synoptics, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" if genuine, can scarcely be otherwise historically conceived than as a surrender of his last hope that God's will would not continue his sufferings even unto death (*Zum Ev. des Paulus u. Petr.*, p. 227).

[2] The repeated statement in the Gospels, that the women and his disciples did not at first recognise the risen Jesus, is quoted in connection with this point.

The phenomenon which has to be accounted for is the Apostolic belief that, after he had been dead and buried, Jesus "was seen" (ὤφθη) by certain persons. The explanation which we offer, and which has long been adopted in various forms by able critics, is that doubtless Jesus was seen, but the vision was not real and objective, but illusory and subjective: that is to say, Jesus was not himself seen, but only a representation of Jesus within the minds of the beholders. This explanation not only does not impeach the veracity of those who affirmed that they had seen Jesus, but, accepting to a certain extent a subjective truth as the basis of the belief, explains upon well-known and natural principles the erroneous inference deduced from the subjective vision. It seems to us that the points to be determined are simple and obvious: Is it possible for a man to mistake subjective impressions for objective occurrences? Is it possible that any considerable number of persons can at the same time receive similar subjective impressions and mistake them for objective facts? If these questions can be answered affirmatively, and it can be shown that the circumstances, the characters, the constitution of those who believed in the first instance, favoured the reception of such subjective impressions and the deduction of erroneous inferences, it must be admitted that a satisfactory explanation can thus be given of the Apostolic belief on other grounds than the reality of a miracle opposed to universal experience.

No sooner is the first question formulated than it becomes obvious to everyone who is acquainted with psychological and physiological researches, or who has even the most elementary knowledge of the influence of the mind upon the body, that it must at once be answered in the affirmative. Indeed, the affirmation that subjective impressions, in connection with every sense, can be mistaken for, and believed to be, actual objective effects is so trite that it seems almost superfluous to make it. Every reader must be well acquainted with illustrations of the fact. The only difficulty is to deal authoritatively with such a point within moderate compass. We must limit ourselves to the sense of sight. "There are abundant proofs," says Sir Benjamin Brodie, "that impressions may be made in the brain by other causes simulating those which are made on it by external objects through the medium of the organs of sense, thus producing false perceptions, which may, in the first instance, and before we have had time to reflect on the subject, be mistaken for realities."[1] The limitation here introduced, "before we have had time to reflect on the subject," is, of course, valid in the case of those whose reason is capable of rejecting the false perceptions, whether on the ground

[1] *Psychological Inquiries*, 1854, p. 78; cf. 79 f.

of natural law or of probability; but, in anyone ignorant of natural law, but familiar with the idea of supernatural agency and the occurrence of miraculous events, it is obvious that reflection, if reflection of a sceptical kind can even be assumed, would have little chance of arriving at any true discrimination of phenomena. Speaking of the nervous system and its functions, and more immediately of the relation of the Cerebrum to the Sensorium and the production of spectral illusions, Dr. Carpenter says, in his work on the *Principles of Mental Physiology*: "Still stronger evidence of the same associated action of the Cerebrum and Sensorium is furnished by the study of the phenomena designated as *Spectral Illusions*. These are clearly *sensorial* states *not* excited by external objects; and it is also clear that they frequently originate in cerebral changes, since they represent *creations* of the mind, and are not mere reproductions of past sensations." Dr. Carpenter refers, in illustration, to a curious illusion to which Sir John Herschel was subject, "in the shape of the involuntary occurrence of visual impressions, into which geometrical regularity of form enters as the leading character. These were not of the nature of those ocular Spectra which may be attributed with probability to retinal changes."[1] Dr. Carpenter then continues: "We have here *not* a reproduction of sensorial impressions formerly received, but a *construction* of *new* forms by a process which, if it had been carried on *consciously*, we should have called imagination. And it is difficult to see how it is to be accounted for in any other way than by an unconscious action of the cerebrum; the products of which impress themselves on the sensorial consciousness, just as, in other cases, they express themselves through the motor apparatus."[2] The illusions described by Sir John Herschel, who, as he himself says, was "as little visionary as most people," should be referred to.

Of the production of sensations by ideas there can be no possible doubt,[3] and, consequently, as little of the realisation by the person in whom they are produced of subjective impressions exactly as though they were objective. With regard to false perceptions, Dr. Carpenter says: "It has been shown that the action of *ideational* states upon the Sensorium can modify or even produce *sensations*. But the action of pre-existing states of Mind is still more frequently shown in modifying the *interpretation* which we put upon our sense-impressions. For, since almost every such interpretation is an act of *judgment* based upon experience, that judgment will vary

[1] Sir John Herschel gives a full account of them in his *Popular Lectures on Scientific Subjects* (Daldy, Isbester, & Co., 1876, p. 402 f.).

[2] *Principles of Mental Physiology*, 4th ed., 1876, p. 113 f.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 155 f.

according to our mental condition at the time it is delivered; and will be greatly affected by any dominant idea or feeling, so as even to occasion a complete mis-interpretation of the objective source of the sense-impression, as often occurs in what is termed 'absence of mind.' The following case, mentioned by Dr. Tuke[1] as occurring within his own knowledge, affords a good example of this fallacy: 'A lady was walking one day from Penrhyn to Falmouth, and, her mind being at that time, or recently, occupied by the subject of drinking-fountains, thought she saw in the road a newly-erected fountain, and even distinguished an inscription upon it—namely, "*If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink.*" Some time afterwards she mentioned the fact with pleasure to the daughters of a gentleman who was supposed to have erected it. They expressed their surprise at her statement, and assured her that she must be quite mistaken. Perplexed with the contradiction between the testimony of her senses and of those who would have been aware of the fact had it been true, and feeling that she could not have been deceived ("for seeing is believing"), she repaired to the spot, and found to her astonishment that no drinking-fountain was in existence—only a few scattered stones, which had formed the foundation upon which the suggestion of an expectant imagination had built the superstructure. The subject having previously occupied her attention, these sufficed to form, not only a definite erection, but one inscribed by an appropriate motto corresponding to the leading idea.'"[2]

We may give as another illustration an illusion which presented itself to Sir Walter Scott.[3] He had been reading, shortly after the death of Lord Byron, an account in a publication professing to detail the habits and opinions of the poet. As Scott had been intimate with Lord Byron, he was deeply interested in the publication, which contained some particulars relative to himself and other friends. "Their sitting-room opened into an entrance hall, rather fantastically fitted up with articles of armour, skins of wild animals, and the like. It was when laying down his book, and passing into this hall, through which the moon was beginning to shine, that the individual of whom I speak saw, right before him, and in a standing posture, the exact representation of his departed friend whose recollection had been so strongly brought to his imagination. He stopped for a single moment, so as to notice the wonderful accuracy with which fancy had impressed upon the bodily eye the peculiarities of dress and posture of the illustrious poet. Sensible, however, of the delusion, he felt no sentiment save that of wonder at the extraordinary accuracy of the

[1] *Influence of the Mind on the Body*, p. 44. [2] Carpenter, *ib.*, 206 f.
[3] It is likewise quoted by Dr. Carpenter, p. 207 f.

resemblance, and stepped onward towards the figure, which resolved itself, as he approached, into the various materials of which it was composed. These were merely a screen, occupied by great-coats, shawls, plaids, and such other articles as usually are found in a country entrance-hall. The spectator returned to the spot from which he had seen the illusion, and endeavoured, with all his power, to recall the image which had been so singularly vivid. But this was beyond his capacity," etc.[1] Although Sir Walter Scott might be sensible of the delusion, it may be more than doubted whether, in the first century of our era, such an apparition proceeding from or connected with religious agitation of mind would have been considered so.

Dr. Abercrombie[2] mentions many instances of spectral illusions, "some of the most authentic facts" relating to which he classes under the head of "intense mental conceptions so strongly impressed upon the mind as, for the moment, to be believed to have a real existence." We cannot, however, venture to quote illustrations.[3] Dr. Hibbert, in whose work on Apparitions many interesting instances are to be found, thus concludes his consideration of the conditions which lead to such illusions: "I have at length concluded my observations on what may be considered as the leading mental laws which are connected with the origin of spectral impressions. The general inference to be drawn from them is, that *Apparitions are nothing more than morbid symptoms, which are indicative of an intense excitement of the renovated feelings of the mind.*"[4] Subjective visions, believed to have had objective reality, abound in the history of the world. They are familiar to all who have read the lives of the Saints, and they have accompanied the progress of Christianity in various forms from the trances of Montanism to the vision of the "Immaculate Conception" in the Grotto of Lourdes.

If we turn to the inquiry whether a similar subjective impression can be received by many persons at one time and be mistaken by them for an objective reality, an equally certain reply in the affirmative must unhesitatingly be given. The contagiousness of emotion is well known,[5] and the rapidity with which panic, for instance, spreads from a single individual to the mass is remarked every day. The most trifling incident, unseen by more than a

[1] *Demonology and Witchcraft*, 1868, Letter i., p. 37 f.

[2] *Inquiries Concerning the Intellectual Powers*, 19th ed., p. 274 f.

[3] Everyone remembers the case of Luther and his visions of the Devil.

[4] *Sketches of the Philosophy of Apparitions*, by Samuel Hibbert, M.D., F.R.S.E., 2nd ed., 1825, p. 375.

[5] We might point in illustration to the use of "Tongues" in the Corinthian Church, where the contagiousness of the ecstatic state is exemplified (1 Cor. xiv. 23, 26 f.).

few, and, therefore, more pliant in the imagination of the many, has instantaneously convinced multitudes of the most erroneous inferences. We need not refer to the numerous religious and other mental epidemics which have swept over the face of the world, infecting society with the wildest delusions. From Montanism to camp meetings and revivals in our own day, it has been demonstrated that religious excitement and dominant ideas have spread with astonishing rapidity and power amongst the circles in which they have arisen. In certain states of nervous expectation, false impressions are instantaneously transmitted from one to another in a religious assembly. Dr. Carpenter says: "Moreover, if not only a single individual, but several persons, should be 'possessed' by one and the same idea or feeling, the same misinterpretation may be made by all of them; and in such a case the concurrence of their testimony does not add the least strength to it. Of this we have a good example in the following occurrence cited by Dr. Tuke, as showing the influence of a 'dominant idea' in falsifying the perceptions of a number of persons at once:—'During the conflagration at the Crystal Palace in the winter of 1866–67, when the animals were destroyed by the fire, it was supposed that the Chimpanzee had succeeded in escaping from his cage. Attracted to the roof, with this expectation in full force, men saw the unhappy animal holding on to it, and writhing in agony to get astride one of the iron ribs. It need not be said that its struggles were watched by those below with breathless suspense, and, as the newspapers informed us, 'with sickening dread.' But there was no animal whatever there; and all this feeling was thrown away upon a tattered piece of blind, so torn as to resemble to the eye of fancy the body, arms, and legs of an ape!' (*Op. cit.*, p. 44). Another example of a like influence affecting several individuals simultaneously in a similar manner is mentioned by Dr. Hibbert in his well-known treatise on Apparitions: 'A whole ship's company was thrown into the utmost consternation by the apparition of a cook who had died a few days before. He was distinctly seen walking ahead of the ship, with a peculiar gait by which he was distinguished when alive, through having one of his legs shorter than the other. On steering the ship towards the object it was found to be a piece of floating wreck.' Many similar cases might be referred to, in which the imagination has worked up into 'apparitions' some commonplace objects, which it has invested with attributes derived from the previous mental state of the observer; and the belief in such an apparition as a reality, which usually exists in such cases, unless antagonised by an effort of the reason, constitutes a *delusion*."[1]

[1] *Principles of Mental Physiology*, 1876, p. 208 f.

We must maintain, indeed, that a number of persons assembled under the influence of strong similar ideas, and excited by the same active religious emotion, are more likely to be affected by similar subjective impressions to the extent of believing them to be objective than one or two would be. The excitement of each acts upon the whole body, and is itself increased by reaction from the aggregate emotion. Each receives impressions from the other, which are vividly felt even without being verified by personal experience. The most nervous temperament in the assembly gives the final impetus to the excited imagination of the rest. In moments of supreme expectation and doubt enthusiasm overcomes reason. If one man see, if one man hear, the mental impression is credited with an objective cause, even when unfelt by others, and then a similar impression is soon carried from the brain to the sensorium of all. This does not involve the supposition of a diseased mind in ordinary cases, and in the instances which we have in view the false perceptions were, obviously, determined and encouraged by foregone conclusions of a nature rarely possible, and, when existing, rarely resisted. "There are many persons," adds Dr. Carpenter, "quite sane upon ordinary matters, and even (it may be) distinguished by some special form of ability, who are yet affected with what the writer once heard Mr. Carlyle term a 'diluted insanity'; allowing their minds to become so completely 'possessed' by 'dominant ideas' that their testimony as to what they declare themselves to have witnessed—even when several individuals concur in giving exactly the same account of it—must be regarded as utterly untrustworthy."[1]

That subjective impressions can, in the opinion of eminent Apologists, be recorded by an Evangelist as objective reality, we have already pointed out in connection with the statement of the first Synoptist, that "Many bodies of the saints were raised; and they came out of the sepulchres after his Resurrection and appeared unto many" (xxvii. 52 f.). Milman and Dr. Farrar explain this by the supposition that the earthquake "seemed to have filled the air with ghostly visitants, who after Christ had risen appeared to linger in the Holy City."[2] It follows as a logical consequence that, as this subjective impression felt by many at once is described in the Gospel as objective, these writers not only admit the possibility of such a mistake on the part of the observers, but that the Gospel, in adopting that mistake, may be suspected of a similar course in recording the appearances of Jesus.[3]

[1] *Principles of Mental Physiology*, 1876, p. 209.

[2] Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ii., p. 419; Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, i. 336 f. Passages quoted p. 817 f.

[3] We refer readers to some most interesting remarks of Dr. Lightfoot on the miraculous elements in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (*Apost. Fathers*, part ii.,

We have thus replied to the question whether the "vision hypothesis" could explain the belief of 500, or even of eleven persons, who supposed they had seen Jesus, and we do not think that any one who seriously considers the age and the circumstances under which the phenomenon is alleged to have occurred can doubt that such belief could very easily have resulted from merely subjective impressions. Before going further into the discussion of the matter, however, we must again, with a little more minuteness, call attention to the date of the actual statements upon which the whole argument turns. The Apostle Paul writes about a quarter of a century after the time when it is said that Jesus "was seen" by those whom he names. Whatever opinion may be formed as to the amount of information obtained by Paul during the visit he paid to Jerusalem for the purpose of making the acquaintance of Peter, it is undeniable that some years had elapsed between the time when Jesus is supposed to have been seen and the time when Paul could have received information regarding these appearances from any of the Apostles. If we date the death of Jesus in the year 33, almost the latest date assigned to it by any eminent critic, and the conversion of Paul about A.D. 38–40,[1] it will be remembered that the Apostle himself states that he did not go to Jerusalem till three years after, which brings us to A.D. 41–43 as the earliest time when Paul first came in personal contact with Peter and James. He did not go up to Jerusalem again for fourteen years after that, and we have no reason to believe that he met any of the Apostles in the interval, but the contrary, from his own account of that second visit, Gal. ii. 2. He could not, therefore, have heard anything of the appearances of Jesus even from Peter and James till some eight to ten years after they had taken place. From the other Apostles, in all probability, he cannot have heard anything till nearly twenty years had elapsed since they supposed they had seen Jesus.

Where did he get his information regarding the 500 brethren at once? From whom did he get it? If the supposed appearance took place, as so many suggest, in Galilee, the date of his information is still more uncertain. If, on the other hand, it occurred in Jerusalem, whilst so many of the number were visitors

1885, p. 598) which are particularly appropriate whilst considering this argument. They are quoted in *A Reply* to his Essays, 1889, p. 154 f.

[1] The *Chronicon Paschale* dates it 42; and the following critics date it as noted: Michaelis, about 37? Kuinoel, 40; Heinrichs, 37? Eichhorn, 37 or 38; Hug, 35; Schmidt, 41; Bertholdt, 40; Feilmoser, 35; Winer, 38? de Wette, 37 or 38; Schott, 37; Schrader, 39; Anger, 38? Wieseler, 40; Ewald, 38; Meyer, 35 (Wieseler, *Chronologie des apost. Zeitalters*, 1848, *Chronologische Tabelle;* Meyer, *Apg.*, p. 24).

only, it is obvious that the greater part must subsequently have left the Holy City and become scattered to their respective homes. The difficulty of obtaining information from more than a few of the 500 becomes obvious. In any case, from no authority which we are entitled to assume could Paul have been minutely informed of these appearances less than eight to ten years after they occurred, and, then, of the vision of the Eleven, only from one of the number to whom the first vision appeared. Now, no one who considers the operation of memory, even in persons of more than usual sobriety of imagination, dealing with circumstances not likely to be exaggerated or distorted by feeling in the course of time, can doubt that, in ten years, all the details of such occasions, amidst which much excitement certainly prevailed, must have assumed a very different aspect from that which they originally bore. We may be permitted to quote a few words on this subject: "Though we are accustomed to speak of memory as if it consisted in an *exact* reproduction of past states of Consciousness, yet experience is continually showing us that this reproduction is very often *inexact*, through the modification which the 'trace' has undergone in the interval. Sometimes the trace has been partially obliterated; and what remains may serve to give a very erroneous (because imperfect) view of the occurrence.....And where it is one in which our own Feelings are interested, we are extremely apt to lose sight of what goes against them, so that the representation given by Memory is altogether one-sided. This is continually demonstrated by the entire dissimilarity of the accounts of the same occurrence or conversation, which shall be given by two or more parties concerned in it, even when the matter is fresh in their minds, and they are honestly desirous of telling the truth. And this diversity will usually become still more pronounced with the lapse of time, the trace becoming gradually but unconsciously modified by the habitual course of thought and feeling; so that when it is so acted on after a lengthened interval as to bring up a reminiscence of the original occurrence, that reminiscence really represents, *not* the actual occurrence, but the modified trace of it."[1] This is specially likely to occur where, as in our case, there were Old Testament prophecies supposed to describe minutely the sufferings, death, and resurrection of the Messiah, to furnish lines which the transformation of memory must insensibly follow. Unconsciously, we may be certain, the misty outlines of the original transaction would acquire consistency and take form according to the tenour of so infallible an index. It would require a memory of iron and of more than stubborn doggedness to resist the unobtrusive influence of supposed prophecies. Be it clearly understood that we speak

[1] Carpenter, *Principles of Mental Physiology*, 1876, p. 456.

of an unconscious process, which is perfectly consistent with complete belief that the transformed trace exactly represents what originally took place.

Adhering more closely to the point before us, can we suppose that the account which Paul received of these appearances, after that lapse of time, was a perfectly sober and unwarped description of what actually took place? We think not. Is it possible that the vision of the 500, for instance, had escaped the maturing influence of time? or that of the Eleven? We believe that it is not possible. However, Paul does not give a single detail, and consequently this argument mainly affects the abstract value of all such evidence, whether at first or second hand, but it likewise makes more vague the original transaction, so indefinitely sketched for us, which we have to explain. What was it the 500 really saw? "Jesus," says the report matured by time; and modern divines, taking the statement in its most objective sense, demand an explanation of the unknown phenomenon which led 500 to believe that they actually saw the risen Master. Did the 500 originally think anything of the kind? What impression did the individuals receive? Did any two receive precisely the same impressions? There is not the slightest evidence that they did. Although Paul gives the most meagre report of these appearances that could well be conceived, it must be remembered that the impression made upon his own mind was not by the events themselves, but by the narrative of the events recounted at least eight or ten years afterwards. There can be no doubt that, earlier, Paul the persecutor must also frequently have heard of the Resurrection, and of alleged occasions when Jesus had been seen after his death and burial, from persecuted members of the Christian community; but beyond the undefined certainty of this we are not entitled to go. That what he heard must have received warmth of colouring from the fire of persecution is most probable. Of this, however, we shall speak presently.

It is not necessary further to enlarge upon the superstition of the age of which we write. We have elsewhere quoted the opinion of an orthodox divine and Hebrew scholar on the character of the Jewish people about that period. "Not to be more tedious, therefore, in this matter," he says, "let two things only be observed: i. That the nation under the second Temple was given to magical arts beyond measure; and ii. That it was given to an easiness of believing all manner of delusions beyond measure."[1] And again: "It is a disputable case whether the Jewish nation were more mad with superstition in matters of

[1] Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ;* Works, ed. Pitman, 1823, xi., p. 81.

religion, or with superstition in curious arts."[1] Even supposing the Twelve to have been men of superior intelligence to most of their fellow countrymen of the period, it cannot reasonably be questioned that they were "men of like passions" and failings with the rest, and that, as were the most eminent men of all countries for centuries after, they were ignorant of the true order of nature, full of superstitious ideas regarding cosmical phenomena, and ready at all times to believe in miracles and supernatural interference with the affairs of life. As Jews, moreover, they had inherited belief in angelic agency and divine apparitions. The Old Testament is full of narratives in which God appears to the Patriarchs and Lawgivers of Israel. Celestial visions had been familiar to every Jew from his infancy, and the constant personal communications of God with his peculiar people were still the most sacred traditions of the nation.

Nursed in the prevalent superstition of the time, educated by the Law and the Prophets to familiarity with the supernatural, and prepared by the fervid imagination of their race to recognise wonders in heaven and earth, the disciples were naturally prepared for the great Christian Miracle. The special circumstances in which they were placed at the death of Jesus conduced in the highest degree to excite that expectant attention which, in their state of profound agitation, rendered them readily susceptible of extraordinary impressions. The disciples had for a long period followed Jesus and felt the influence of his elevated character. It may be doubted how far they had entered into the spirit of his teaching, or understood the spiritual wisdom which lay beneath the noble simplicity of his language; but it cannot be doubted that his personal greatness must have produced a profound effect upon their minds. When they came at last to understand, if in a material and imperfect way, his views as to his Messianic character, they can have had little difficulty in believing, in spite of the mysterious lowliness and humility of his aspect, although probably in a sense widely different from his own, that the hope of Israel had at last come, and that the hour of her redemption was at hand. It is probable that, as the enmity of the priests and rulers increased, and the danger of his position became more apparent, whilst he disdained unworthily to shrink from his public work, he must have felt all the peril before him, and observed the anxiety of his followers. It may be conceived that, under such circumstances, his teaching may have assumed even a higher spirituality than before, and, rising above the clouds of the present, soared out into that calmer future when the religion he founded would be accepted by men, and become a light to

[1] *Ib.*, xi., p. 299 f.

the Gentiles and the glory of his people Israel. It is probable that he may have spoken of his death in spiritual terms as a sacrifice for them and for the world, which would secure the triumph of his work and regenerate mankind. Comforting those who had left all and followed him, but from whom he might so soon be parted, and knowing their doubts and fears, he must have re-assured their minds by inspiriting views of the inseparable nature of his union with those who loved him and did his commandments; his spirit dwelling within them and leading them safely through the world, in the peace and security of souls raised by the truth beyond the reach of its corruption and its wrong.

That they must have felt the strongest conviction of his Messianic character cannot be doubted, however confused may have been their ideas of the exact nature of his office, and of the manner in which his coming was to secure the triumph of Israel. The shock to their expectations and the utter dissipation of their hopes which must have been felt in the first moment of his arrest, hurried trial, and cruel condemnation can well be imagined. It is probable that, in that first moment of terror and bewilderment, the disciples indeed all forsook him and fled. No one who had consorted with the Great Teacher, however, and felt the influence of his mind, could long have resisted the reaction to nobler thoughts of him. In all the bitterness of sorrow for the loss of their master and friend, in horror at his agonising and shameful death, and in doubt, consternation, and almost despair, they must have gathered together again and spoken of these strange events. Believing Jesus to have been the Messiah, how could they interpret his death on the cross? If he was the Messiah, could he thus die? If Enoch and Elijah, if Moses, precursors of the Messiah, had not seen death, how could that prophet like unto Moses whom God had raised up end his career by a shameful death on the cross?

Throughout that time of fiery trial and supreme mental agitation they must have perpetually sought in their own minds some explanation of the terrible events then occurring and seeming to blast all their hopes, and doubtless mystic utterances of Jesus must have assumed new meanings -meanings probably different from his own. In the accounts of the coming Messiah in the prophets they must have searched for some light by which to solve the inexplicable problem. Is it not conceivable that, in that last time of danger and darkness, when he saw the persecution against him become more vehement, and felt that the path which he had chosen led him through danger and distress, perhaps to death Jesus may, in the bitter contemplation of that fanatical opposition of bigotry and superstition, have applied to himself the description of the suffering servant of God,

suffering—as all noble souls have done who are in advance of their age, and preach great truths which condemn either directly or by implication the vices and follies of their time—"the oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely," and, worse still, the ignoble insults of popular ignorance and fickleness? Here might seem to them the solution of the enigma; and, returning from that first flight of terror and bewilderment, feeling all the intense reaction of affection and grief, and faith in the Master quickened by shame at their abandonment of him in his moment of supreme affliction, still believing that he must be the Messiah, and in mute longing and expectation of the next events which were to confirm or confound their hopes, the disciples must have been in the climax of nervous agitation and excitement, and ready to receive any impression which might be suggested in their embarrassment.[1]

According to Paul, it was Peter who first saw the risen Jesus. According to the first and fourth Gospels, the first appearance was to the women, and notably, in the latter, to Mary Magdalene, out of whom had been cast "seven devils," and whose temperament probably rendered her unusually susceptible of all such impressions. Did Paul intentionally omit all mention of the appearances to the women, or did he not know of them? In the latter case, we have an instructive light thrown on the Gospel tradition; in the former, the first suggestion of the Resurrection becomes even more clearly intelligible. It will be observed that in all this explanation we are left chiefly to conjecture, for the statements in the Gospels cannot, upon any point, be used with the slightest confidence. On the other hand, all that is demanded is that a probable or possible explanation of the origin of the belief in the Resurrection should be given; and, in the total absence of historical data, we are entitled to draw inferences as to the course of events at the time. It may well be that a mistake as to the sepulchre, rendered not improbable if any hint of the truth be conveyed in the conflicting traditions of the Gospel, or one of many other suggestions which might be advanced, might lead the women or Peter to believe that the sepulchre was empty. Or some other even trifling circumstance, which we can no longer indicate with precision, might convey to the women or to Peter, in their state of nervous excitement, the last impulse wanting to cause that rapid revulsion from extreme depression, which is so suitable to the state which we may, perhaps,

[1] Ewald points out that, according to the belief of the period, the souls of the dead hovered for a time between heaven and earth, and he considers that the belief undeniably played an important part in this sphere of visions of the Christ (*Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vi., p. 72 a.).

be allowed to call creative subjectivity. If we are to accept the indications scattered about the New Testament, the impetuous ardent temperament of Peter was eminently one to bound into sudden ecstatic enthusiasm, and in all probability some commonplace or trifling incident may have been the spark which kindled into flame the materials already at glowing heat. The strong subjective impression that Jesus had risen would create a vision of him which, at once confirming previous conclusions, resolving perplexing doubts, and satisfying feverish expectations, would be accepted by each mind with little or no question as an objective reality. If Peter, or even the women, brought to the disciples the assurance that they had seen the Lord, we cannot doubt that, in the unparalleled position in which they were then placed, under all the circumstances of intense feeling and religious excitement at the moment, such emotions would be suddenly called into action as would give to these men the impression that they had seen the Master whom they had lost. These subjective impressions would be strengthened daily and unconsciously into ever more objective consistency, and, being confirmed by supposed prophecy, would be affirmed with a confidence insensibly inspired by dogmatic considerations. That the news would fly from believer to believer, meeting everywhere excited attention and satisfying eager expectancy, is certain ; and that these devout souls, swayed by every emotion of glad and exultant enthusiasm, would constantly mistake the suggestions of their own thoughts for objective realities is probable. Jesus died, was buried, and rose again "according to the Scriptures." This would harden every timid supposition into assurance ; and, as time went on, what was doubtful would become certain, what was mysterious, clear ; and those who had seen nothing would take up and strengthen the tradition of those who had seen the Lord.

It is argued that there was not time for the preparation of the disciples to believe in the Resurrection of Jesus between his crucifixion and "the third day," when that event is alleged to have occurred, and, consequently, no probability of subjective impressions of so unexpected a nature being received. To those Apologists who adopt this argument we might point to many passages in the Gospels which affirm that the Resurrection on the third day was predicted. These, however, we assign, of course, to a later date. The argument assumes that there was no preparation in the teaching of Jesus, but this, as we have endeavoured to suggest, is not the case. If there had been no other, the mere assurance that he was the Messiah must have led to reflections, which demanded some other sequel to his career than the death of a slave. The mere suggestion of such a problem as must have proposed itself to the minds of the disciples: If all is to end here,

Jesus was not the Messiah: if he was the Messiah, what will now happen? must have led to expectant attention. But there was much more than this. In such moments as those of the Passion, thought works feverishly and fast. It is not to be supposed that Peter and the rest did not foresee the end, when Jesus was led away prisoner in the hands of his enemies. It is still less to be imagined that their minds were not ceaselessly revolving that problem, on the solution of which depended their fondest hopes and highest aspirations. It is most probable, indeed, that no time could have found the disciples in a state so ripe for strong impressions as that immediately succeeding the death of their Master.

There are, however, other aspects in which this point may be placed. What evidence is there that Jesus was seen, or supposed to have been seen, on the third day? Absolutely none worthy of the name. Paul does not say that he was; and as for the Gospels, their statement is of no value, and the tradition which they record may be set down as a foregone dogmatic conclusion. Paul very distinctly shows this. He says: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he has been raised the third day, according to the Scriptures."[1] The repetition of the phrase, "according to the Scriptures," is very marked, and points to the fact that the purpose for which Jesus died—"for our sins"—and the date of his Resurrection—"the third day"—are statements directly based upon Scripture. We have mentioned that the Scriptures supposed to indicate the third day do not really apply to the Messiah at all, but this does not affect the question before us. Now, believing this epoch to be defined in prophecy, this is precisely one of those points upon which memory would, in the lapse of time, be most likely to adjust itself to the prophecy. We will assume that Jesus was not "seen" before the third day. It is obvious that, if he was seen forty days after, it might be affirmed that he had been actually raised long before, on the third day. The vision occurring on the third day itself, even, could not prove that he had not "risen" before. There is, in fact, no reason o fix the third day except the statement of "Scripture," and, the moment we accept that, we must recognise the force of dogmatic influence.[2] The fact that the third day has from early times been set apart as the Christian Sabbath does not prove anything. If the third day was

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 3 f.

[2] We do not go into any argument based on the order given in the first two Synoptics to go into Galilee—a three days' journey at least—where the disciples were to see Jesus. Nor need we touch upon other similar points which arise out of the narratives of the Gospels.

believed to be the day indicated by "Scripture" for the Resurrection, of course that day would be selected as the time at which it must have occurred, and on which it should be commemorated. So far as the vision hypothesis is concerned, the day is of no consequence whatever, and the objection upon this point has no force.

There is another consideration which we must mention, which is not only important in connection with an estimate of the evidence for the Resurrection, but the inferences from which clearly support the explanation we are proposing. Before stating it we may, in passing, again refer to the fact that it is nowhere affirmed that anyone was an eye-witness of the actual Resurrection. It is supposed to be proved by the circumstance that Jesus was subsequently "seen." Observe, however, that the part of this miracle which could not well have been ascribed to subjective impressions—the actual resurrection—is, naturally enough, not seen by anyone, but that which comes precisely within the scope of such subjective action is said to have been seen by many. To come at once to our point, neither Paul, nor the Gospels, nor Christian tradition in any form, pretends that Jesus was seen by any one but his disciples and those who believed in him. In fact, Jesus only appeared to those who were prepared by faith and expectant attention to see him in the manner we assert. We are at present merely speaking of the earlier appearances, and reserving Paul for separate discussion. Why, we may inquire, did Jesus not appear to his enemies as well as to his friends? Nothing of course could have been more intelligible than his desire to comfort and reassure those who believed in and mourned for him, but to do this by no means excluded a wider manifestation of himself, supposing him to have actually risen from the dead. On the hypothesis that he only rose again and was seen through the yearning and enthusiastic faith of his followers, the reason why he was not seen by others is not hard to find. Yet it might be thought that the object of at once establishing beyond doubt his supernatural mission, and convincing his enemies of their crime and the Jews of their blindness and folly, was important enough. Had he shown himself to the Chief Priests and elders, and confounded the Pharisees with the vision of him whom they had so cruelly nailed to the accursed tree, how might not the future of his followers have been smoothed, and the faith of many made strong! Or if he had stood again in the Courts of the Roman Procurator, no longer a prisoner buffeted and spat upon, but the glorious Messiah, beyond the reach of Jewish malignity or Roman injustice! But no, he was seen by none but those devoted to him. We shall, of course, be told by Apologists that this also was "for the trial of our faith"; though, to anyone who earnestly reflects, it

must seem childish to ask men to believe what is beyond their reason, yet conceal the evidence by which reason is supposed to be guided. The reply, however, is clear: for the trial of our faith or for any other reason, it is nevertheless certain that this evidence does not exist. When the argument which we are now discussing was first advanced long ago by Celsus, Origen had no better refutation than, after admitting the fact that Jesus was not after his resurrection seen as before publicly and by all men, to take refuge in the belief that the passage of Paul regarding his appearances contains wonderful mysteries which, if understood, would explain why Jesus did not show himself after that event as he had done before it.[1]

We must now proceed to show that the vision of Paul is satisfactorily explained by the same hypothesis. We have already proved that there is no evidence of any value that Paul's conversion was due to his having seen Jesus in a manner which he believed to be objective and supernatural. To represent the arch persecutor Paul transformed in a moment, by a miraculous vision of Jesus, into the Apostle of the Gentiles was highly characteristic of the author of Acts, who further represents Paul as immediately preaching publicly in Damascus and confounding the Jews. Widely different is the statement of Paul. He distinctly affirms that he did not communicate with flesh and blood, nor went he up to Jerusalem to them which were Apostles before him, but that he immediately went away into Arabia. The Fathers delighted in representing this journey to Arabia as an instance of Paul's fervour and eagerness to preach the Gospel in lands over which its sound had not yet gone forth. There can be no doubt, however, that Paul's journey to Arabia and his sojourn there were for the purpose of reflection. It is only in legends that instantaneous spiritual revolutions take place. In sober history the process is more slow and progressive. We repeat that there is no evidence which can at all be accepted that Paul's conversion was effected by a vision, and that it is infinitely more probable that it was, so to say, merely completed and crowned by "seeing Jesus"; but, at the same time, even if the view be held that this vision was the decisive circumstance which induced Paul at once to resign his

[1] *Contra Cels.*, ii. 63. It is curious that, in an earlier chapter, Origen, discussing the question of Celsus, whether any one who had been actually dead had ever risen with a real body, says that if Celsus had been a Jew who believed that Elijah and Elisha had raised little children he could not have advanced this objection. Origen adds that he thinks the reason why Jesus appeared to no other nation but the Jews was, that they had become accustomed to miracles, and could, by comparing the works of Jesus and what was told of him with what had been done before, recognise that he was greater than all who had preceded him. ii. 57.

course of persecution and embrace Christianity, our argument is not materially affected. In any case, much silent, deep, and almost unconscious preparation for the change must long before have proceeded in the mind of Paul, which was finally matured in the Arabian waste. Upon no view that is taken can this be excluded; upon every ground of common sense, experience, and necessary inference, it must be admitted.

Indifference is the only great gulf which separates opinions. There was no stolid barrier of apathy between Saul of Tarsus and belief in the Messiahship of Jesus. In persecuting Christianity, Paul proved two things: the earnestness and energy of his convictions, and the fact that his attention was keenly directed to the new sect. Both points contributed to the result we are discussing. Paul's Judaism was no mere formalism. It was the adoption, heart and soul, of the religion of his people; which was to him no dead principle, but a living faith stimulating that eager, impetuous character to defend its integrity with "fire and sword." He did not, like so many of his countrymen, turn away with scorn from the followers of the despised Nazarene and leave them to their delusion; but turned to them, on the contrary, with the fierce attraction of the zealot whose own belief is outraged by the misbelief of others. The earnest Jew came into sharp collision with the earnest Christian. The earnestness of each was an element of mutual respect. The endurance and firmness of the one might not melt the bigoted resolution of the other, but it arrested his attention and commanded his unconscious sympathy. Just so would the persecutor have endured and resisted persecution; so, subsequently, he actually did meet it. And what was the main difference between the persecutor and the persecuted? It consisted in that which constituted the burden of the apostolic preaching: the belief that "this was the Christ." The creed of the new sect at least was not complicated. It was little more at that time than a question of identity, until Paul himself developed it into an elaborate system of theology.

In this question of identity, however, there was comprised a vast change of national ideas. To the devout Jew—looking for the hope of Israel, yearning and praying for the advent of that Son of David who was to sit upon the throne of his fathers, restore the fortunes of the people, drive out the heathen and subdue the nations again to the yoke of Israel, establishing the worship of God in its purity and turning the Gentiles to the service of the God of Gods—it was an abhorrent thought that the lowly peasant who had died a shameful death on Golgotha should be represented as the Messiah, the promised King of the Jews. Still, there was something sufficiently startling in the idea to excite reflection. A political aspirant, who pretended to play the part, and after some

feeble attempt at armed insurrection had been crushed by the heel of the Roman, could not have attracted attention. In that there would have been no originality to astonish, and no singularity to require explanation. This man, on the contrary, who was said to be the Messiah, assumed no earthly dignity; claimed no kingdom in this world; had not even a place whereon to lay his head; but ended a short and unambitious career as the teacher of a simple but profound system of morality by death on a cross. There was no vulgar imitation here. This was the reverse of the Messiah of the Jews. In spite of so much dissimilarity, however, there was in the two parties a fundamental agreement of belief. The Jew expected the Messiah; the Christian believed he had now come. The Messiah expected by the Jew was certainly a very different Saviour from the despised and rejected Jesus of Nazareth, but at the root of the Christian faith lay belief in a Messiah. It was a thoroughly Jewish belief, springing out of the covenant with the fathers, and based upon the Law and the Prophets. The difference was not one of principle, but one of details. Their interpretation of the promises was strangely dissimilar, but the trust of both was in the God of Israel. To pass from one to the other did not involve the adoption of a new religion, but merely a modification of the views of the old. Once convinced that the Messiah was not a political ruler but a spiritual guide, not a victorious leader but a suffering servant of God, the transition from Judaic hopes to recognition of Jesus was almost accomplished.

It is clear that Paul, in his capacity of Persecutor, must have become well acquainted with the views of the Christians, and probably must have heard them repeatedly expounded by his captives before the Jewish Sanhedrin. He must have heard the victims of his blind religious zeal affirming their faith with all that ecstatic assurance which springs out of persecution. The vision of Peter contributed to the vision of Paul. There can be no doubt that Paul must have become aware of the application to Jesus of Old Testament prophecies, and of the new conception thence derived of a suffering Messiah. The political horizon was certainly not suggestive of the coming of the Lord's Anointed. Never had the fortunes of Israel been at a lower ebb. The hope of a Prince of the house of David to restore dominion to the fallen race was hard to entertain. The suggestion of an alternative theory based upon a new interpretation of the prophets, if startling, was not untimely, when the old confidence was becoming faint in many minds, and the hope of his coming seemed so distant and unsure. If we do not misjudge the character of Paul, however shocked he may have been at first by the substitution of a crucified Nazarene for the triumphant Messiah of his earlier visions, there must have been something profoundly pleasing to his

mind in the conception of a spiritual Messiah. As he became familiar with the idea, it is probable that flashes of doubt must have crossed his mind as to the correctness of his more material views. If the belief were true, which Christians professed, that this Jesus, despised and rejected of men, was the suffering servant of God, and this servant of God actually the Messiah! If the claim of this Jesus, who had been esteemed smitten of God and afflicted had been verified by his rising again from the dead and ascending to the right hand of God! This aspect of the Messianic idea had a mystery and significance congenial to the soul of Paul. The supernatural elements could have presented no difficulties to him. Belief in the Resurrection was part of his creed as a Pharisee. That the risen Messiah should have been seen by many, the fundamental idea once admitted, could not surprise the visionary Jew. We can well imagine the conflict which went on in the ardent mind of Paul when doubts first entered it; his resistance and struggle for the faith of his youth; the pursuance, as duty, of the course he had begun, whilst the former conviction no longer strengthened the feverish energy; the excitement of religious zeal in the mad course of persecution not to be arrested in a moment, but become, by growing doubt, bitterness and pain to him; the suffering inflicted sending its pang into his own flesh. There was ample preparation in such a situation for the vision of Paul.

The constitution and temperament of the Apostle were eminently calculated to receive impressions of the strongest description. We have mentioned the conjecture of many able men that his "stake in the flesh" was a form of epilepsy. It is, of course, but a conjecture, though one which has great probability,[1] and we must not treat it otherwise; but, if it could be proved correct, much light would be thrown upon Paul's visions. We have discussed the Apostle's statements regarding the supernatural Charismata in the Church, and have seen his extreme readiness to believe in the lavish bestowal of miraculous gifts, where others could recognise but ordinary qualities. That Paul should be able to claim the power of speaking with tongues more than all the Corinthians, whose exercise of that spiritual gift he so unceremoniously restrains, is in perfect keeping with all that we elsewhere learn about him. Everywhere we find the keenly impressionable nature so apt to fall into the ecstatic state when brought under the influence of active religious emotion. "I must glory," he exclaims with irresistible impulse on coming to a theme so congenial to him, "I must glory; it is not indeed expedient, but I will come to visions and revelations of the

[1] Cf. Gal. iv. 13; 1 Cor. ii. 3.

Lord."[1] Even when he speaks of the stake in his flesh, which he does in such suggestive connection with his visions, he describes it as sent lest he should "be exalted above measure by the excess of the revelations."[2] We have so repeatedly had to refer to Paul's claim to have received his Gospel by special revelation that we need not again speak of it here. If we could quote Acts as a genuine representation of Christian tradition regarding Paul, we might point out the visions and revelations therein so freely ascribed to him, but his own writings are amply sufficient for our purpose. Even his second journey to Jerusalem is attributed to the direction of revelation.[3]

The only vision regarding which the Apostle gives any particulars is that referred to, 2 Cor. xii. 2: "I know a man in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in the body I know not, whether out of the body I know not, God knoweth), such an one caught up even unto the third heaven. 3. And I know such a man (whether in the body or out of the body I know not, God knoweth), 4. that he was caught up into Paradise and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter. 5. For such an one will I boast," etc.[4] It has been argued from this passage, and the repetition of the expression "whether in the body or out of the body I know not," that Paul himself could clearly distinguish objective facts from subjective impressions. No interpretation could well be more erroneous. It is evident that Paul has no doubt whatever of his having been in the third heaven and in Paradise, and as little of his having heard the unspeakable words. That is quite objectively real to him. His only doubt is whether the body was caught up with his soul upon this occasion.[5] No one who has carefully considered such phenomena and examined the statements here made can have any doubt as to the nature of this vision. The conception of being caught up into "the third heaven," "into Paradise," and there hearing these "unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter," betrays in no doubtful manner the source of the subjective impressions. Of course, divines who are prepared to see in this passage the account of an actual objective event will not consider it evidence that Paul had subjective visions which he believed to have been objective facts; but to those who, more rightly and reasonably, we think, recognise the subjective character of the vision, it must at once definitely settle the point that Paul could mistake subjective impressions for objective realities, and

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 1. [2] 2 Cor. xii. 7. [3] Gal. ii. 2. [4] 2 Cor. xii. 2–5.

[5] Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1864, p. 174 f.; Holsten, *Zum Ev. Paulus u. Petr.*, p. 21 f., p. 122 f. Hilgenfeld points out that the representation of such a separation from the body as Paul here contemplates is to be found in Philo (*De Somniis*, i., § 6).

consequently the argument for the similar subjectivity of the vision of Jesus becomes complete. The possibility of such a mistake is precisely what Apologists question. Here is an instance in which the mistake has clearly been made by Paul.

The Apostle's own statements show him to have been superlatively visionary and impressionable, with restless nervous energy, it is true, but, at the same time, with keen physical and mental susceptibility. Liable to be uplifted by "the excess of revelations," glorying in "visions and revelations of the Lord," possessing ecstatic powers more than all others, subjecting his very movements, his visits to Jerusalem, to the direction of impulses which he supposed to be revelations; there has never been a case in which both temperament and religious belief more thoroughly combined to ascribe, with perfect conviction, objective reality to subjective impressions connected with divine things then occupying his mind.

Paul, moreover, lived in a time when the Messianic longing of the Jews led them to be profoundly interested students of the later apocalyptic writings, which certainly made a deep impression upon the Apostle, and in which he must have been struck by the image of the promised Messiah, like the Son of Man, coming on the clouds of heaven (Dan. vii. 13, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 47). At no time was such a vision more likely to present itself to him than when his mind was fixed upon the Messianic idea with all the intensity of one who had been persecuting those who asserted that the Messiah had already come. Here was reason for all that concentration of thought upon the subject which produces such visions; and when doubt and hesitation entered into that eager intense spirit, the conflict must have been sharp and the nerves highly strung. The Jesus whom he saw with his mind's eye was the climax of conviction in such a nature; and the vision vividly brought to him his own self-reproachful thoughts for mistaken zeal, and the remorse of noble souls which bounds to reparation. He devoted himself as eagerly to Christianity as he had previously done to Judaism. He changed the contents but not the form of his mind. Paul the Christian was the same man as Paul the Jew; and, in abandoning the conception of a Messiah "according to the flesh," and placing his whole faith in one "according to the spirit," he displayed the same characteristics as before. The revolution in his mind, of which so much is said, was merely one affecting the Messianic idea. He did not at a bound become the complete Apostle of the Gentiles, but, accepting at first nothing more than belief in a Messiah according to the spirit, his comprehensive and peculiar system of theology was, of course, only the result of subsequent reflection. That his conviction should have been completed by a subjective vision is no more strange than that he

should believe in supernatural Charismata, miraculous speaking with tongues, and being actually caught up into the third heaven, into Paradise, and hearing there unutterable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter. Paul evidently never questioned the source of his visions. They were simply accepted as divine revelations, and they excited all the less of misgiving in his soul from the fact that, without doubt, they expressed the expected solution of problems which intensely occupied his mind, and reflected conclusions already practically formed by his own thoughts.[1]

There remain two points to be briefly considered. The first of these is the assertion, constantly made in various shapes, that the cardinal miracles of the Resurrection and Ascension were proclaimed as unquestionable facts, without contradiction, at a time when such an assertion might have been easily refuted. The production of the body, the still occupied sepulchre, it is said, would have set such pretensions at rest. It is unnecessary to say that the proclamation of the Resurrection and Ascension as facts proved nothing beyond the belief, perhaps, of those who asserted them. So far as Paul is concerned, we may seek in vain for any assertion of a bodily Ascension. But there is not the slightest evidence to show when the Resurrection and Ascension were first publicly proclaimed as unquestionable facts. Even the Gospels do not state that they were mentioned beyond the circle of disciples. The second Synoptist, who does not state that Jesus himself was seen by anyone, makes the curious affirmation at the close of his Gospel as we have it, that the women, on receiving the announcement of the Resurrection from the angels, and the command for the disciples and Peter to go into Galilee, "went out and fled from the sepulchre; for trembling and astonishment seized them, and they said nothing to anyone; for they were afraid."[2] In the fourth Gospel, although the "beloved disciple" went into the sepulchre, "and he saw and believed," it is related of him and Peter: "So the disciples went away again unto their own home."[3] The Eleven, in fact, who all forsook their Master

[1] "If those appearances (to his disciples) were purely *subjective*," objects Dr. Farrar, "how can we account for their sudden, rapid, and total cessation?" (*Life of Christ*, ii., p. 432, note 1). We might reply that, if objective, such a cessation would be still more unaccountable. Being subjective, the appearances, of course, ceased when the conditions of excitement and expectancy which produced them passed away. But, in point of fact, they did not suddenly and totally cease. The appearance to Paul occurred after a considerable interval, and there is the tradition of more than one appearance to him; but throughout the history of the Church we hear of similar subjective visions whenever a fitting individual has been found in the state to receive them.

[2] Mark xvi. 8. [3] John xx. 10.

and fled—who are represented as meeting with closed doors "for fear of the Jews"—with closed doors after eight days, it is again said, although a week before ten of them are said to have seen Jesus—were not likely to expose themselves to the fate of Jesus by rushing into the highways and asserting the Resurrection. Beyond the statement of the Gospels, the value of which we have seen, and which is accompanied by so many confused circumstances, there is no evidence whatever that the sepulchre was found empty. There is no evidence that the sepulchre was really known to the disciples, none of whom, probably, was present at the crucifixion; and it might well be inferred that the women, who are represented as ignorant that the body had already been embalmed, yet who are the chief supposed witnesses for the empty sepulchre and the informants of the disciples, were equally ignorant of the sepulchre in which the body was laid. We might ask whether the 500 brethren who are said to have seen Jesus at the same time came from Galilee, or wherever they were, and examined the state of the sepulchre? We have already said, however, that, if the sepulchre had been shown to be empty, the very last thing which could be proved by that circumstance would be the correctness of the assertion that it had become so in consequence of a stupendous miracle. On the other hand, if it had been shown that it was occupied by a body, it is exceedingly doubtful whether the fact would have convinced anyone not previously sure that Jesus could not have risen from the dead, and he would not have required such evidence. When the Resurrection was publicly proclaimed as a fact, the body could no longer have been recognisable; and the idea that any of those in authority could have thought such demonstration necessary to refute a story whispered about amongst an obscure sect in Jerusalem, or even more courageously asserted, is a product of later times. When Jesus of Nazareth, the head of the nascent sect, was suppressed by a shameful death, his humble and timid followers were, obviously, for a time despised; and there is little reason to suppose that the chief priests and rulers of the Jews would have condescended to any public contradiction of their affirmations, if they had even felt indifference to the defilement of exposing, for such a purpose, a decaying body to the gaze of Jerusalem. This kind of refutation is possible only in the imagination of divines. Besides, what evidence is there that even a single indifferent person found the sepulchre empty? There is not an iota of proof.

On the contrary, there is the very strongest evidence that, when the assertion of the Resurrection and Ascension as "unquestionable facts" was made, it was contradicted in the only practical and practicable way conceivable: (1) by all but universal disbelief in

Jerusalem ; (2) by actual persecution of those who asserted it. It is a perfectly undeniable fact that the great mass of the Jews totally denied the truth of the statement by disbelieving it, and that the converts to Christianity, who soon swelled the numbers of the Church and spread its influence amongst the nations, were not the citizens of Jerusalem, who were capable of refuting such assertions, but strangers and Gentiles. The number of the community of Jerusalem after the forty days seems to be stated by the author of Acts as "about 120," and, although the numbers added to the Church, according to this document, are evidently fabulous, the converts at Pentecost are, apparently, chiefly from amongst the devout men of every nation upon earth congregated at Jerusalem. To this hour the Jews have retained as their inheritance the denial by their forefathers of the asserted facts. The assertion, secondly, was emphatically denied by the persecution, as soon as it became worth any one's while to persecute, of those who made it. It was in this way denied by Paul himself, at a time when verification was infinitely more possible than when he came to join in the assertion. Are we to suppose that the Apostle took no trouble to convince himself of the facts before he began to persecute? He was in the confidence of the high priests, it seems; can he ever have heard the slightest doubt from them on the subject? Is it not palpable that Paul and his party, by their very pursuit of those who maintained such allegations, stigmatised them as falsehoods, and perhaps as imposture? If it be said that Paul became convinced of his mistake, it is perfectly obvious that his conversion was not due to local and circumstantial evidence, but to dogmatic considerations and his supposed vision of Jesus. He disbelieved when the alleged occurrences were recent and, as it is said, capable of refutation ; he believed when the time for such refutation had passed.

The second point to which we have referred is the vague and final objection of Apologists that, if the vision of Jesus was merely subjective, the fabric of the Church and even of Christianity is based upon unreality and self-deception. Is this possible? they ask. Is it possible that for eighteen centuries the Resurrection and Ascension have been proclaimed and believed by millions, with no other original foundation than self-delusion? The vagueness and apparent vastness of this objection, perhaps, make it a formidable *argumentum ad hominem*, but it vanishes into very small proportions as we approach it. Must we, then, understand that the dogmas of all religions which have been established must have been objective truths? and that this is a necessary inference from their wide adoption? If so, then all historical religions before Christianity, and after it, must take rank as substantially true. In that case the religion of the Veda, of Buddha, of Zoroaster, of

Mohammed, for instance, can as little be based on unreality and self-deception as Christianity. They have secured wide acceptance from mankind. Millions have for centuries devoutly held their tenets, and to this day the followers of Sâkya Muni are as numerous as the believers in the religion of Paul. If not, the objection at once falls to the ground as an argument, and the problem becomes a simple matter of evidence, which has been fully discussed and disposed of.

When we analyse the fact, it becomes apparent that, ultimately, belief in the Resurrection and Ascension resolves itself into the belief of a few or of one. It requires very little reflection to perceive that the Christian Church is founded much more upon belief in the Resurrection than on the reality of the fact itself. Nothing is more undeniable than the circumstance that not more than a very small number of men are even alleged to have seen the risen Jesus. The mass of those who have believed in the Resurrection have done so because of the assurance of these few men, and perhaps because they may have been led to think that the event was predicted in Scripture. Up to this day, converts to the dogma are made, if made at all, upon the assurance of Paul and the Gospels. The vast question at last dwindles down to the inquiry: Can a few men, can one man, draw erroneous inferences and be honestly deceived by something supposed to have been seen? We presume that there can be no hesitation in giving an affirmative reply. The rest follows as a matter of course. Others simply believe the report of those who have believed before them. In course of time, so many believe that it is considered almost outrageous to disbelieve or demand evidence. The number of those who have believed is viewed at last as an overwhelming proof of the truth of the creed.

It is a most striking and extraordinary fact that the life and teaching of Jesus have scarcely a place in the system of Paul. Had we been dependent upon him, we should have had no idea of the Great Master who preached the Sermon on the Mount, and embodied pure truths in parables of such luminous simplicity. His noble morality would have remained unknown, and his lessons of rare spiritual excellence have been lost to the world. Paul sees no significance in that life, but concentrates all interest in the death and Resurrection of his Messiah. The ecclesiastical Christianity which was mainly Paul's work has almost effaced the true work of Jesus. In the sepulchre hewn out of the rock are deposited the teaching and example of Jesus, and from it there rises a mystic Christ lost in a halo of theology.

CONCLUSIONS

We have seen that Divine Revelation could only be necessary or conceivable for the purpose of communicating to us something which we could not otherwise discover, and that the truth of communications which are essentially beyond and undiscoverable by reason cannot be attested in any other way than by miraculous signs distinguishing them as divine. It is admitted that no other testimony could justify our believing the specific Revelation which we are considering, the very substance of which is supernatural and beyond the criticism of reason, and that its doctrines, if not proved to be miraculous truths, must inevitably be pronounced "the wildest delusions." "By no rational being could a just and benevolent life be accepted as proof of such astonishing announcements."

On examining the alleged miraculous evidence for Christianity as Divine Revelation, we find that, even if the actual occurrence of the supposed miracles could be substantiated, their value as evidence would be destroyed by the necessary admission that miracles are not limited to one source and are not exclusively associated with truth, but are performed by various spiritual Beings, Satanic as well as Divine, and are not always evidential, but are sometimes to be regarded as delusive and for the trial of faith. As the doctrines supposed to be revealed are beyond Reason, and cannot in any sense be intelligently approved by the human intellect, no evidence which is of so doubtful and inconclusive a nature could sufficiently attest them. This alone would disqualify the Christian miracles for the duty which only miracles are capable of performing.

The supposed miraculous evidence for the Divine Revelation, moreover, is not only without any special divine character, being avowedly common also to Satanic agency, but it is not original either in conception or details. Similar miracles are reported long antecedently to the first promulgation of Christianity, and continued to be performed for centuries after it. A stream of miraculous pretension, in fact, has flowed through all human history, deep and broad as it has passed through the darker ages, but dwindling down to a thread as it has entered days of enlightenment. The evidence was too hackneyed and commonplace to make any impression upon those before whom the Christian miracles are said to have been performed, and it altogether failed to convince the people to whom the Revelation was primarily

addressed. The selection of such evidence for such a purpose is much more characteristic of human weakness than of divine power.

The true character of miracles is at once betrayed by the fact that their supposed occurrence has thus been confined to ages of ignorance and superstition, and that they are absolutely unknown in any time or place where science has provided witnesses fitted to appreciate and ascertain the nature of such exhibitions of supernatural power. There is not the slightest evidence that any attempt was made to investigate the supposed miraculous occurrences, or to justify the inferences so freely drawn from them, nor is there any reason to believe that the witnesses possessed, in any considerable degree, the fulness of knowledge and sobriety of judgment requisite for the purpose. No miracle has yet established its claim to the rank even of apparent reality, and all such phenomena must remain in the dim region of imagination. The test applied to the largest class of miracles, connected with demoniacal possession, discloses the falsity of all miraculous pretension.

There is no uncertainty as to the origin of belief in supernatural interference with nature. The assertion that spurious miracles have sprung up round a few instances of genuine miraculous power has not a single valid argument to support it. History clearly demonstrates that, wherever ignorance and superstition have prevailed, every obscure occurrence has been attributed to supernatural agency, and it is freely acknowledged that, under their influence, inexplicable and miraculous are convertible terms. On the other hand, in proportion as knowledge of natural laws has increased, the theory of supernatural interference with the order of nature has been dispelled, and miracles have ceased. The effect of science, however, is not limited to the present and future, but its action is equally retrospective, and phenomena which were once ignorantly isolated from the sequence of natural cause and effect are now restored to their place in the unbroken order. Ignorance and superstition created miracles ; knowledge has for ever annihilated them.

To justify miracles two assumptions are made : first, an Infinite Personal God ; and second, a Divine design of Revelation, the execution of which necessarily involves supernatural action. Miracles, it is argued, are not contrary to nature, or effects produced without adequate causes, but, on the contrary, are caused by the intervention of this Infinite Personal God for the purpose of attesting and carrying out the Divine design. Neither of the assumptions, however, can be reasonably maintained.

The assumption of an Infinite Personal God, a Being at once limited and unlimited, is a use of language to which no mode of

human thought can possibly attach itself. Moreover, the assumption of a God working miracles is emphatically excluded by universal experience of the order of nature. The allegation of a specific Divine cause of miracles is further inadequate from the fact that the power of working miracles is avowedly not limited to a Personal God, but is also ascribed to other spiritual Beings; and it must, consequently, always be impossible to prove that the supposed miraculous phenomena originate with one and not with another. On the other hand, the assumption of a Divine design of Revelation is not suggested by antecedent probability, but is derived from the very Revelation which it is intended to justify, as is likewise the assumption of a Personal God, and both are equally vicious as arguments. The circumstances which are supposed to require this Divine design, and the details of the scheme, are absolutely incredible, and opposed to all the results of science. Nature does not countenance any theory of the original perfection and subsequent degradation of the human race; and the supposition of a frustrated original plan of creation, and of later impotent endeavours to correct it, is as inconsistent with Divine omnipotence and wisdom as the proposed punishment of the human race, and the mode devised to save some of them, are opposed to justice and morality. Such assumptions are essentially inadmissible, and totally fail to explain and justify miracles.

Whatever definition may be given of miracles, such exceptional phenomena must at least be antecedently incredible. In the absence of absolute knowledge, human belief must be guided by the balance of evidence, and it is obvious that the evidence for the uniformity of the order of nature, which is derived from universal experience, must be enormously greater than can be the testimony for any alleged exception to it. On the other hand, universal experience prepares us to consider mistakes of the senses, imperfect observation, and erroneous inference as not only possible, but eminently probable on the part of the witnesses of phenomena, even when they are perfectly honest and truthful, and more especially so when such disturbing causes as religious excitement and superstition are present. When the report of the original witnesses only reaches us indirectly and through the medium of tradition, the probability of error is further increased. Thus the allegation of miracles is discredited, both positively by the invariability of the order of nature, and negatively by the fallibility of human observation and testimony. The history of miraculous pretension in the world, and the circumstances attending the special exhibition of it which we are examining, suggest natural explanations of the reported facts which wholly remove them from the region of the supernatural.

When we proceed to examine the direct witnesses for the

Christian miracles, we do not discover any exceptional circumstances neutralising the preceding considerations. On the contrary, we find that the case turns not upon miracles substantially before us, but upon the mere narratives of miracles said to have occurred over eighteen hundred years ago. It is obvious that, for such narratives to possess any real force and validity, it is essential that their character and authorship should be placed beyond all doubt. They must proceed from eye-witnesses capable of estimating aright the nature of the phenomena. Our four Gospels, however, are strictly anonymous works. The superscriptions which now distinguish them are undeniably of later origin than the works themselves, and do not proceed from the composers of the Gospels. Of the writers to whom these narratives are traditionally ascribed, only two are even said to have been Apostles, the alleged authors of the second and third Synoptics neither having been personal followers of Jesus nor eye-witnesses of the events they describe. Under these circumstances, we are wholly dependent upon external evidence for information regarding the authorship and trustworthiness of the four canonical Gospels.

In examining this evidence we proceeded upon clear and definite principles. Without forming or adopting any theory whatever as to the date or origin of our Gospels, we simply searched the writings of the Fathers, during a century and a half after the events in question, for information regarding the composition and character of these works, and even for any certain traces of their use, although, if discovered, these could prove little beyond the mere existence of the Gospels used at the date of the writer. In the latter and minor investigation we were guided by canons of criticism previously laid down, and which are based upon the simplest laws of evidence. We found that the writings of the Fathers, during a century and a half after the death of Jesus, are a complete blank so far as any evidence regarding the composition and character of our Gospels is concerned, unless we except the tradition preserved by Papias, after the middle of the second century, the details of which fully justify the conclusion that our first and second Synoptics, in their present form, cannot be the works said to have been composed by Matthew and Mark. There is thus no evidence whatever directly connecting any of the canonical Gospels with the writers to whom they are popularly attributed, and later tradition, of little or no value in itself, is separated by a long interval of profound silence from the epoch at which they are supposed to have been composed. With one exception, moreover, we found that, during the same century and a half, there is no certain and unmistakable trace even of the anonymous use of any of our Gospels in the early Church. This fact, of course, does not justify the conclusion that none of these

Gospels was actually in existence during any part of that time, nor have we anywhere suggested such an inference; but strict examination of the evidence shows that there is no positive proof that they were. The exception to which we refer is Marcion's Gospel, which was, we think, based upon our third Synoptic, and consequently must be accepted as evidence of the existence of that work. Marcion, however, does not give the slightest information as to the authorship of the Gospel, and his charges against it of adulteration cannot be considered very favourable testimony as to its infallible character. If it be received that Tatian's Diatessaron is based upon our four Gospels, nothing further than their mere existence at that period is proved. The canonical Gospels continue to the end anonymous documents of no evidential value for miracles. They do not themselves pretend to be inspired histories, and they cannot escape from the ordinary rules of criticism. Internal evidence does not modify the inferences from external testimony. Apart from continual minor contradictions throughout the first three Gospels, it is impossible to reconcile the representations of the Synoptics with those of the fourth Gospel. They mutually destroy each other as evidence. They must be pronounced mere narratives, compiled long after the events recorded, by unknown persons who were neither eye-witnesses of the alleged miraculous occurrences, nor hearers of the statements they profess to report. They cannot be accepted as adequate testimony for miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation.

Applying these tests to the Acts of the Apostles, we arrived at the same results. Acknowledged to be composed by the same author who produced the third Synoptic that author's identity is not thereby made more clear. There is no evidence of the slightest value regarding its character, but, on the other hand, the work itself teems to such an extent with miraculous incidents and supernatural agency that the credibility of the narrative requires an extraordinary amount of attestation to secure for it any serious consideration. When the statements of the author are compared with the emphatic declarations of the Apostle Paul, and with authentic accounts of the development of the early Christian Church, it becomes evident that the Acts of the Apostles, as might have been supposed, is a legendary composition of a later day, which cannot be regarded as sober and credible history, and rather discredits than tends to establish the reality of the miracles with which its pages so suspiciously abound.

The remaining books of the New Testament Canon required no separate examination, because, even if genuine, they contain no additional testimony to the reality of Divine Revelation, beyond

the implied belief in such doctrines as the Incarnation and Resurrection. It is unquestionable, we suppose, that in some form or other the Apostles believed in these miracles, and the assumption that they did so supersedes the necessity for examining the authenticity of the Catholic Epistles and Apocalypse. In like manner, the recognition as genuine of four Epistles of Paul, which contain his testimony to miracles, renders it superfluous to discuss the authenticity of the other letters attributed to him.

The general belief in miraculous power and its possession by the Church is brought to a practical test in the case of the Apostle Paul. After elaborate consideration of his letters, we came to the unhesitating conclusion that, instead of establishing the reality of miracles, the unconscious testimony of Paul clearly demonstrates the facility with which erroneous inferences convert the most natural phenomena into supernatural occurrences.

As a final test, we carefully examined the whole of the evidence for the cardinal dogmas of Christianity: the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus. First taking the four Gospels, we found that their accounts of these events are not only full of legendary matter, but that they even contradict and exclude each other; and so far from establishing the reality of such stupendous miracles, they show that no reliance is to be placed on the statements of the unknown authors. Taking next the testimony of Paul, which is more important as at least authentic and proceeding from an Apostle of whom we know more than of any other of the early missionaries of Christianity, we saw that it was indefinite and utterly insufficient. His so-called "circumstantial account of the testimony upon which the belief in the Resurrection rested" consists merely of vague and undetailed hearsay, differing, so far as it can be compared, from the statements in the Gospels, and without other attestation than the bare fact that it is repeated by Paul, who doubtless believed it, although he had not himself been a witness of any of the supposed appearances of the risen Jesus which he so briefly catalogues. Paul's own personal testimony to the Resurrection is limited to a vision of Jesus, of which we have no authentic details, seen many years after the alleged miracle. Considering the peculiar and highly nervous temperament of Paul, of which he himself supplies abundant evidence, there can be no hesitation in deciding that this vision was purely subjective, as were likewise, in all probability, the appearances to the excited disciples of Jesus, if they ever really occurred. The testimony of Paul himself, before his imagination was stimulated to ecstatic fervour by the beauty of a spiritualised religion, was an earnest denial of the great Christian dogma emphasised by the active persecution of those who affirmed it; and a vision, especially in the case of one so constituted, supposed to be seen many years

after the fact of the Resurrection had ceased to be capable of verification, is not an argument of convincing force. We were compelled to pronounce the evidence for the Resurrection and Ascension absolutely and hopelessly inadequate to prove the reality of such stupendous miracles, which must consequently be unhesitatingly rejected. There is no reason given, or even conceivable, why allegations such as these, and dogmas affecting the religion and even the salvation of the human race, should be accepted upon evidence which would be declared totally insufficient in the case of any common question of property or title before a legal tribunal. On the contrary, the more momentous the point to be established, the more complete must be the proof required.

If we test the results at which we have arrived by general considerations, we find them everywhere confirmed and established. There is nothing original in the claim of Christianity to be regarded as Divine Revelation, and nothing new either in the doctrines said to have been revealed, or in the miracles by which it is alleged to have been distinguished. There has not been a single historical religion largely held amongst men which has not pretended to be divinely revealed, and the written books of which have not been represented as directly inspired. There is not a doctrine, sacrament, or rite of Christianity which has not substantially formed part of earlier religions; and not a single phase of the supernatural history of the Christ, from his miraculous conception, birth, and incarnation, to his death, resurrection, and ascension, which has not had its counterpart in earlier mythologies. Heaven and hell, with characteristic variation of details, have held an important place in the eschatology of many creeds and races. The same may be said even of the moral teaching of Christianity, the elevated precepts of which, although in a less perfect and connected form, had already suggested themselves to many noble minds and been promulgated by ancient sages and philosophers. That this Inquiry into the reality of Divine Revelation has been limited to the claim of Christianity has arisen solely from a desire to condense it within reasonable bounds, and confine it to the only religion in connection with which it could practically interest us now.

There is nothing in the history and achievements of Christianity which can be considered characteristic of a religion divinely revealed for the salvation of mankind. Originally said to have been communicated to a single nation, specially selected as the peculiar people of God, and for whom distinguished privileges were said to be reserved, it was almost unanimously rejected by that nation at the time, and it has continued to be repudiated by its descendants with singular unanimity to the present day. After more than nineteen centuries, this Divine scheme of salvation has

not obtained even the nominal adhesion of more than a third of the human race, and if, in a census of Christendom, distinction could now be made of those who no longer seriously believe in it as Supernatural Religion, Christianity would take a much lower numerical position. Sâkya Muni, a teacher only second in nobility of character to Jesus, and who, like him, proclaimed a system of elevated morality, has even now almost twice the number of followers, although his missionaries never sought converts in the West. Considered as a scheme Divinely devised as the best, if not only, mode of redeeming the human race and saving them from eternal damnation, promulgated by God himself incarnate in human form, and completed by his own actual death upon the cross for the sins of the world, such results as these can only be regarded as practical failure, although they may not be disproportionate for a system of elevated morality.

We shall probably never be able to determine how far the great Teacher may, through his own speculations or misunderstood spiritual utterances, have suggested the supernatural doctrines subsequently attributed to him, and by which his whole history and system soon became transformed; but no one who attentively studies the subject can fail to be struck by the absence of such dogmas from the earlier records of his teaching. It is to the excited veneration of the followers of Jesus that we owe most of the supernatural elements so characteristic of the age and people. We may look in vain, even in the synoptic Gospels, for the doctrines elaborated in the Pauline Epistles and the Gospel of Ephesus. The great transformation of Christianity was effected by men who had never seen Jesus, and who were only acquainted with his teaching after it had become transmuted by tradition. The fervid imagination of the East constructed Christian theology. It is not difficult to follow the development of the creeds of the Church, and it is certainly most instructive to observe the progressive boldness with which its dogmas were expanded by pious enthusiasm. The New Testament alone represents several stages of dogmatic evolution. Before his first followers had passed away the process of transformation had commenced. The disciples, who had so often misunderstood the teaching of Jesus during his life, piously distorted it after his death. His simple lessons of meekness and humility were soon forgotten. With lamentable rapidity, the elaborate structure of ecclesiastical Christianity, following stereotyped lines of human superstition, and deeply coloured by Alexandrian philosophy, displaced the simple morality of Jesus. Doctrinal controversy, which commenced amongst the very Apostles, has ever since divided the unity of the Christian body. The perverted ingenuity of successive generations of Churchmen has filled the world with theological quibbles, which

naturally enough culminated in doctrines of Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility.

It is sometimes affirmed, however, that those who proclaim such conclusions not only wantonly destroy the dearest hopes of humanity, but remove the only solid basis of morality; and it is alleged that, before existing belief is disturbed, the iconoclast is bound to provide a substitute for the shattered idol. To this we may reply that speech or silence does not alter the reality of things. The recognition of Truth cannot be made dependent on consequences, or be trammelled by considerations of spurious expediency. Its declaration in a serious and suitable manner to those who are capable of judging can never be premature. Its suppression cannot be effectual, and is only a humiliating compromise with conscious imposture. In so far as morality is concerned, belief in a system of future rewards and punishments, although of an intensely degraded character, may, to a certain extent, have promoted observance of the letter of the law in darker ages and even in our own; but it may, we think, be shown that education and civilisation have done infinitely more to enforce its spirit. How far Christianity has promoted education and civilisation we shall not here venture adequately to discuss. We may emphatically assert, however, that whatever beneficial effect Christianity has produced has been due, not to its supernatural dogmas, but to its simple morality. Dogmatic theology, on the contrary, has retarded education and impeded science. Wherever it has been dominant civilisation has stood still. Science has been judged and suppressed by the light of a text or a chapter of Genesis. Almost every great advance which has been made towards enlightenment has been achieved in spite of the protest or the anathema of the Church. Submissive ignorance, absolute or comparative, has been tacitly fostered as the most desirable condition of the popular mind. "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven," has been the favourite text of Doctors of Divinity with a stock of incredible dogmas difficult of assimilation by the virile mind. Even now the friction of theological resistance is a constant waste of intellectual power. The early enunciation of so pure a system of morality, and one so intelligible to the simple as well as profound to the wise, was of great value to the world; but, experience being once systematised and codified, if higher principles do not constrain us, society may safely be left to see morals sufficiently observed. It is true that, notwithstanding its fluctuating rules, morality has hitherto assumed the character of a Divine institution; but its sway has not, in consequence, been more real than it must be as the simple result of human wisdom and the outcome of

social experience. The choice of a noble life is no longer a theological question, and ecclesiastical patents of truth and uprightness have finally expired. Morality, which has ever changed its complexion and modified its injunctions according to social requirements, will necessarily be enforced as part of human evolution, and is not dependent on religious terrorism or superstitious persuasion. If we are supposed to say, *Cui bono?* and only practise morality, or be ruled by right principles, to gain a heaven or escape a hell, there is nothing lost; for such grudging and calculated morality is merely a spurious imitation which can as well be produced by social compulsion. But if we have ever been really penetrated by the pure spirit of morality, if we have in any degree attained that elevation of mind which instinctively turns to the true and noble and shrinks from the baser level of thought and action, we shall feel no need of the stimulus of a system of rewards and punishments in a future state which has for so long been represented as essential to Christianity.

The argument so often employed by theologians, that Divine Revelation is necessary for man, and that certain views contained in that Revelation are required by our moral consciousness, is purely imaginary and derived from the Revelation which it seeks to maintain. The only thing absolutely necessary for man is Truth; and to that, and that alone, must our moral consciousness adapt itself. Reason and experience forbid the expectation that we can acquire any knowledge otherwise than through natural channels. We might as well expect to be supernaturally nourished as supernaturally informed. To complain that we do not know all that we desire to know is foolish and unreasonable. It is tantamount to complaining that the mind of man is not differently constituted. To attain the full altitude of the Knowable, whatever that may be, should be our earnest aim, and more than this is not for humanity.

We gain more than we lose by awaking to find that our theology is human invention, and our eschatology an unhealthy dream. We are freed from the incubus of base Hebrew mythology, and from doctrines of Divine government which outrage morality and set cruelty and injustice in the place of holiness. If we have to abandon cherished anthropomorphic visions of future blessedness, the details of which are either of unseizable dimness or of questionable joy, we are at least delivered from quibbling discussions of the meaning of *αἰώνιος*, and our eternal hope is unclouded by the doubt whether mankind is to be tortured in hell for ever and a day, or for a day without the ever. At the end of life there may be no definite vista of a Heaven glowing with the light of apocalyptic imagination, but neither will there be the unutterable horror of a Purgatory or a Hell, lurid with flames, for the helpless victims of

an unjust but omnipotent Creator. To entertain such libellous representations at all as part of the contents of "Divine Revelation," it was necessary to assert that man was incompetent to judge of the ways of the God of Revelation, and must not suppose him endowed with the perfection of human conceptions of justice and mercy, but submit to call wrong right and right wrong at the foot of an almighty Despot. But now the reproach of such reasoning is shaken from our shoulders, and returns to the Jewish superstition from which it sprang.

Let us ask what has actually been destroyed by such an inquiry pressed to its logical conclusion. Can Truth by any means be made less true? Can reality be melted into thin air? The supposed Revelation not being a reality, that which has been destroyed is only an illusion, and that which is left is the truth. Losing belief in it and its contents, we have lost nothing but that which the traveller loses when the mirage, which has displayed cool waters and green shades before him, melts swiftly away. There were no cool fountains really there to allay his thirst; no flowery meadows for his wearied limbs; his pleasure was delusion, and the wilderness is blank. Rather the mirage, with its pleasant illusion, is the human cry, than the desert with its barrenness. Not so, is the friendly warning; seek not vainly in the desert that which is not there, but turn rather to other horizons and to surer hopes. Do not waste life clinging to ecclesiastical dogmas which represent no eternal verities, but search elsewhere for truth which may haply be found.

INDEX

ABERCROMBIE, DR., On Spectral Illusions, 880.

Acts of the Apostles: Character of, 567 f.; alleged references to, 568 f.; by Clement of Rome, 568 f.; by Epistle of Barnabas, 570; by Shepherd of Hermas, 571 f.; by Pseudo-Ignatius, 572 f.; by Epistle of Polycarp, 574 f.; by Epistle to Diognetus, 578 f.; by Tatian, 576 f.; by Dionysius of Corinth, 580; by Athenagoras, 580 f.; by Epistle of Vienne and Lyons, 580 f.; Canon of Muratori on, 581 f.; Fathers assign it to Luke, 582; discussion of authorship, 582 f.; not written by Luke the follower of Paul, 583 f.; evidence regarding authorship, 585 f.; Luke not mentioned in, 586; views of Fathers regarding him, 587 f.; Ewald on authorship of Luke, 588; argument from superscription, 588 f.; traditional view of authorship unsupported by evidence, 590 f.; the personal sections, 591 f.; could not have been written by companion of Paul, 595 f.; comparison with the Pauline Epistles, 595 f.; theory of authorship of Timothy, 598 f.; personal sections do not solve problems, 599 f.; considerations excluding Luke by proving later date, 600 f.; use of works of Josephus by author, 605 f.; consequent date, 611; original purpose of author, 613 f.; parallelism between Peter and Paul, 617 f.; the speeches in, 618 f.; speeches composed by author, 621 f.; speeches of Peter and Paul compared, 623 f.; supposed traces of translation, 629 f.; incongruities in speech of Peter, 632 f.; is its account of primitive Christianity true, 638 f.; martyrdom of Stephen in, 659 f.; no other evidence of Stephen's existence, 661 f.; his trial in, 662 f.; based on that of Jesus, 663 f.; how could Stephen's speech have been reported, 665 f.; errors in the speech, 666 f.; speech examined, 667 f.; the speech composed by author, 670 f.; Philip and the Eunuch in, 673 f.; raising of Tabitha from dead by Peter, 676 f.; Peter and Cornelius in, 677 f.; Paul and Ananias in, 679 f.; Peter in the house of a tanner in Joppa, 681; supposed abrogation of Mosaic proscriptions, 681; statements of, compared with Paul's Epistles, 686 f.; Paul's visits to Jerusalem in, compared with Paul's Epistles, 687 f.; question of circumcision at Antioch, 700 f., 709 f.; council at Jerusalem and Paul's Epistles, 703 f.; Peter's speech, 706 f.; speech of James, 711 f.; speeches composed by author, 713 f.; the Apostolic Decree, 714 f.; the Decree composed by author, 716 f.; Paul's account excludes Decree, 718 f.; no trace of Decree anywhere, 723 f.; the alleged circumcision of Titus, 725 f.; Paul preaches a different Gospel, 729 f.; the final agreement of the Council, 730 f.; alleged circumcision of Timothy, 736 f.; Paul's relation to the Twelve misrepresented in, 743 f.; conclusion: Acts not historical, 750 f.; the Gift of Tongues in, 781 f.; the account in, must be rejected, 787 f.; origin of the account in, 788 f.; the Ascension in, 844 f.; representation of Paul's vision in, not historical, 867 f.

Alford, Dean, on discrepancy regarding appearances of Jesus, 843, n. 2.

Angelology and Demonology of Jews, 61 f.

Apocalypse of John, referred to as

Scripture by Justin Martyr, 188 f., 512 f.; in Canon of Muratori, 429 f.; testimony of Papias according to Andrew of Cæsarea, 485 f.; Dionysius of Alexandria denies authorship of John, 511, 513 f.; Lücke's argument on it, 511 f.; de Wette's argument, 512; Ewald's argument, 512, 515 f.; external argument for John's authorship, 512 f.; Melito of Sardis wrote on it, 513; assigned to Cerinthus, 514; certainty of date of, 514; objection on ground of author's calling himself "Servant of Christ" only, 514 f.; Judaistic character of, 516 f.; character of John in Synoptics, 519 f.; this strongly in favour of his authorship, 521 f.; attacks Paul in Epistles to the Churches, 522 f., 747 f.

Apollinaris, Claudius, 395 f.; fragments attributed to him, 395; on the Passover, 395 f.; no evidence for fourth Gospel, 505.

Arnold, Dr., on Miracles, 12.

Ascensio Isaiæ, referred to by Origen and Epiphanius, 61, n. 5; Angel of Sun and Moon, 61.

Ascension, Resurrection and, evidence of the Gospels, 808 f.; not peculiar to Christianity, 846; evidence of Paul for, 851 f.; evidence inadequate, 872 f.

Athenagoras, cosmical theories of, 72; works ascribed to him, 398 f.; alleged references to Synoptics, 399 f.; no evidence for fourth Gospel in, 505; his Logos doctrine not that of Gospel, 505.

Atterbury, Bishop, Christianity can only be attested by miracles, 3 f.

Augustine, Saint, demonology of, 79 f.; on antipodes, 80 f.; miracles reported by, 100 f.

Barnabas, Epistle of, on clean and unclean animals, 81 f.; account of, 137 f.; identity of author, 137; date of, 138 f.; alleged use of Synoptics examined, 139 f.; alleged reference to fourth Gospel, 435 f.

Basilides, fragments of writings of, 322 f.; opinions of Tischendorf and Westcott regarding them, 322 f.; his gospel, 323 f.; statements of Agrippa Castor, 323 f.; alleged quotations from Synoptics, 325 f.; alleged statements of Hippolytus, 327 f.; they do not refer to him, but to his followers, 328 f.; alleged references to fourth Gospel, 498 f.

Beelen, on: "to the Jew first," 734, n. 1.

Beyschlag, his view of some appearances of Jesus, 856, n. 4.

Brodie, Sir Benjamin, on brain impressions, 877.

Butler, Bishop, Christianity beyond reason, 3; so can only be proved by miracles, 3 f.

Canons of Criticism regarding Gospels, 122 f.; illustrations of, 122 f., 308.

Carpenter, Dr., on spectral illusions, 878 f.; occurring to many at same time, 881.

Celsus, his work: True Doctrine, 422 f.; Origen's refutation, 422 f.; date, 422 f., 427; Origen's ignorance regarding him, 422 f.; no evidence for Synoptics, 427; nor for fourth Gospel, 507.

Christianity, not the only religion claiming to be divinely revealed, 1 f.; evidence for it must be supernatural, 2 f.; primitive, 638 f.; only a sect of Judaism, 641 f.; the Synoptics a history of Jesus the Messiah, 642 f.; Jesus upheld Mosaism, 646 f.; Proselytes, 653 f.; development of, 749 f.

Clement of Alexandria, his cosmical theories, 71 f., 77 f.

Clement of Rome, on the Phœnix, 81; 1 Epistle to Corinthians, 128 f.; date, 129 f.; alleged use of Synoptics, 131 f.; no references to fourth Gospel, 435.

Clementines, Cosmical theories of, 77 f.; how composed, 299 f.; not by Clement of Rome, 298 f.; date of the Homilies, 300 f.; alleged quotations of Synoptics, 301 f.; animosity against Paul, 318 f.; discovery of concluding portion by Dressel, 486; alleged reference to fourth Gospel, 486 f.; quotation from Apocryphal Gospel, 489; its views opposed to those of fourth Gospel, 489 f.; essential identity of Judaism and Christianity maintained in, 492 f.; they maintain that Jesus preached only one year, 496.

Credner, on Canon of Muratori and

fourth Gospel, 509; his argument for John as author of fourth Gospel, 523 f.
Cyprian of Carthage, on Demons, 73.

Demonology and Angelology of Jews, 64 f.
Diognetus, Epistle to, author unknown, 320 f.; last two chapters by different author, 321 f.; date, 321; no references to Synoptics, 321; claimed as witness for fourth Gospel, 496 f.; final statement of the case, 497 f.
Dionysius of Alexandria argues that fourth Gospel and Apocalypse not by same author, 511; attributes Gospel to Apostle John, 511.
Dionysius of Corinth, fragments of his writings and date, 381 f.; interpretations of *Scriptures of the Lord*, 382 f.; Tischendorf's and Westcott's strange inferences, 382 f.; refuted, 383 f.; no evidence for fourth Gospel, 505.
Döllinger, Dr. von, on the Charismata, 775, 777 f.

Enoch, Book of, on Angels and Demons, 59 f.
Eusebius, Angelology and Demonology, 79 f.; silence of, 270 f.; on Hegesippus, 270 f.; on Papias, 276 f., 290 f.; on Pantænus, 291 f.; on Matthew's Gospel, 292 f.; on Tatian's *Diatessaron*, 370 f.
Ewald, on miracles, 19, n. 1; on authorship of fourth Gospel, 512 f.; his theory regarding its composition, 538 f., 558 f.; on Luke as author of Acts, 588 f.; on belief regarding souls of dead, 888, n. 1.

Farrar, Dr., if miracles incredible Christianity false, 7; on Hume's argument, 45 f.; on earthquake and resurrection of saints at Crucifixion, 317 f.; on "some doubted," 842, n. 1; on subjectivity of authors of Gospels, 847; on Westcott's remarks on Resurrection, 847, n. 2; his view of appearance of Jesus to Cephas, 856, n. 1, 882; objections to visions being subjective, 898, n. 1.
Fathers, The, their cosmical theories, 71 f.

Gfrörer, his view of fourth Gospel, 558 f.; his view of appearance of Jesus to Cephas, 856, n. 1; his "Scheintod" theory, 875, n. 1.
Gospel, The fourth, External evidence for, 435 f.; statement regarding it in Canon of Muratori, 507 f.; Canon ascribes it to John, 508 f.; Credner argues it ascribes it to another, 509; authorship and character of, 510 f.; difference of Greek between it and Apocalypse, 511 f.; not both by same author, 511 f.; Dionysius of Alexandria assigns it to John, 511, 513 f.; Lücke on this problem, 511 f.; de Wette's argument, 512 f.; external evidence for John as author of Apocalypse, 512 f.; character of John in Synoptics proves his authorship of Apocalypse, 516 f.; and against his authorship of Gospel, 522 f.; its Greek compared with that of Apocalypse, 524 f.; the Logos doctrine, 525 f.; its animosity against Jews, 526 f.; author not a Jew, 526 f.; errors from that fact, 527 f.; statements regarding Pool of Bethesda examined, 529 f.; regarding woman of Samaria, 531 f.; indications in Synoptics, 532 f.; the desciple whom Jesus loved, 535 f.; chap. xxi., 538 f.; Ewald's theory regarding it, 538 f.; author not eye-witness of scenes described, 545 f.; fundamental difference between it and Synoptics, 548 f.; few miracles in common, 551 f.; the last supper, 552 f.; the arrest, 553 f.; the inscription on the Cross, 554, 810; the raising of Lazarus, 555 f.; the teaching of Jesus profoundly different from that of Synoptics, 557 f.; Gfrörer's view of John's authorship, 559 f.; the arguments destroy its historical value, 560 f.; artificial construction, 561 f.; Paschal controversy against John's authorship, 563 f.; Irenæus on necessity for four gospels, 564 f.; its testimony of no value for miracles, 565; its evidence for Resurrection and Ascension, 808 f.; chronology of Passion Week, 810; parting the garments, 811; the two malefactors, 811 f.; the mother of Jesus, 813; the sayings on the Cross, 814 f.; miracles during the Crucifixion, 816; thrust of spear and

Crurifragium, 820 f.; the Descent from the cross, 823 f.; the Entombment, 824 f.; the Embalmment, 825 f.; the Resurrection, 829 f.; Mary Magdalene at the Sepulchre, 835 f.; appearance to the Eleven, 839 f.; incredulity of Thomas, 841 f.; the Ascension, 844 f.

Gospels, The Synoptic, the evidence required for, 121 f.; canons of criticism, 122 f.; result of examination of evidence regarding them, 433 f.; they give a history of Jesus the Messiah, 642 f.; the suffering Messiah, 644 f.; their evidence for Resurrection and Ascension, 808 f.; chronology of Passion Week, 810 f.; inscription on the Cross, 554 f., 810; parting of the garments, 811; the two malefactors, 811 f.; the mocking speeches, 812 f.; the sayings on the Cross, 814 f.; miracles during the Crucifixion, 816 f.; the Descent from the Cross, 823 f.; the Entombment, 824 f.; the Embalmment, 825 f.; watch at the Sepulchre, 827 f.; the Resurrection, 829 f.; the journey to Emmaus, 837 f.; the Ascension, 844 f.; familiarity with resurrection of dead, 848 f.; episode of Transfiguration, 849 f.

Hamilton, Sir William, on a god understood, 43, n. 2.

Harris, Dr. Rendel, on Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, 151, n. 1, 441; on Bar-Hebræus and *Diatessaron* of Tatian, 375; on Arabic *Diatessaron*, 380.

Hegesippus, account of and date, 268 f.; use of Gospel according to the Hebrews, 270 f.; fragments of his works, 270 f.; his account of martyrdom of James the Just, 272 f.; alleged references to Synoptics, 272 f.; fragment preserved by Stephanus Gobarus, 275; alleged reference to fourth Gospel, 474 f.

Heracleon and Ptolemæus, date 408 f.; Tischendorf's argument, 409 f.; refuted, 411 f.; alleged references to Synoptics, 421 f.; no evidence for fourth Gospel, 506.

Hermas, *see* Shepherd.

Herschel, Sir John, subject to involuntary visual impressions, 878.

Heurtley, Dr., Christianity must be attested by miracles, 4.

Hibbert, Dr., on spectral illusions, 880 f.

Hippolytus, his references to Basilides and his school, 328 f.; references to Valentinus and his school, 330 f.; unwarrantable assertions of Tischendorf regarding him, 330 f.

Holsten, on cry from Cross, 876, n. 1.

Hume, his argument on miracles, 45 f.

Ignatius, Epistles of, 158 f.; their different forms, 158 f.; question of their date and authenticity, 162 f.; arguments of Dr. Lightfoot, 163 f.; on case of Paul, 164; on case of Peregrinus, 164 f.; reasons for believing martyrdom of Ignatius in Antioch and not in Rome, 166 f.; evidence of John Malalas, 168 f.; remains of, interred long in Antioch, 170 f.; Epistles spurious, 171; alleged references to Synoptics, 171 f.; alleged references to fourth Gospel, 441 f.

Irenæus, his argument against disciples of Valentinus, 332 f.; date of his work against Heresies, 411 f.; quotations from Presbyters, 479 f.; on necessity for four Gospels, 564 f.

Jerome, on Pantænus, 291 f.; on appearance of Jesus to James, 857.

Josephus, on King Solomon and demons, 69 f.; Jewish superstitions, 70 f.; use of his works, by author of third Synoptic and Acts, 605 f.; Ascension of Moses, 846.

Jowett, Dr., on Paul's relation to party of Circumcision, 746, n. 2.

Judas, different accounts of his death, by Papias, 296; in Acts, 632 f., 636 f.; in third Synoptic, 637.

Justin Martyr, cosmical theories, 71 f.; account of, 181 f.; date of his works, 182 f.; Memoirs of the Apostles, 182 f.; not our Gospels, 184 f.; title does not indicate plurality of Gospels, 186 f.; read in Christian assemblies, 187 f.; refers to Apocalypse of John as prophecy, 188 f.; references to Old Testament, 188 f.; descent of Jesus always traced through Mary, 190 f.; removal of Joseph to Bethlehem from uncanonical source, 194 f.; genealogies of

Jesus different from Synoptics, 195 f.; also birth and infancy, 196 f.; Magi from Arabia, 198 f.; Jesus believed to be carpenter, 199 f.; narrative of baptism, 200 f.; miracles of Jesus explained as magical art, 204 f.; peculiarities of trial of Jesus, 205 f.; similarity to Gospel of Peter, 207 f.; Agony in Garden, 208 f.; details of Crucifixion, 210 f.; alleged use of Synoptics examined, 216 f.; comparisons of references to Sermon on Mount with Synoptics, 219 f.; systematic variation from them, 240 f.; further alleged references, 241 f.; alleged quotations advanced by Dr. Westcott examined, 243 f.; summary of result, 257 f.; sayings of Jesus unknown to Synoptics, 258 f.; was name of Peter connected with the "Memoirs," 261 f.; Gospel of Peter and of the Hebrews, 262 f.; result regarding alleged quotations, 266 f.; alleged references to fourth Gospel, 448 f.; his Logos doctrine derived from Philo, 449 f.; and from Old Testament and its Apocrypha, 454 f.; his narratives of Jesus opposed to those of fourth Gospel, 437 f.

LACTANTIUS, Angelology and Demonology of, 78 f.; on antipodes, 80.

Liddon, Dr., necessity of miraculous evidence, 22, n. 1.

Lightfoot, John, D.D., Master of Catherine Hall, on Jewish superstition, 57 f., 885 f.

Lightfoot, Dr., on Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, 150 f.; on martyr journey of Ignatius, 163 f.; on case of Paul, 164; on case of Peregrinus, 164 f.; on John Malalas, 168 f.; on Papias in *Chronicon Paschale*, 278, n. 6; on Oracles of God, 287, n. 2; on 1 Cor. x. on the Apostles of the Circumcision, 654, n. 1, 656, n. 2 and n. 3; on "Many days" of Acts, 690, n. 1 and 3; on visits of Paul to Jerusalem, 701, n. 2; on Judaisers in Paul's Epistle, 713, n. 3; on 1 Cor. xii. 10, 763, n. 4.

Logos doctrine, in Canonical Epistles, 449 f.; in Philo, 450 f.; sources of, in Justin Martyr, 453 f.; in Old Testament and Apocrypha, 454 f.

Lücke on authorship of fourth Gospel, 511 f.

Luke, Gospel of, alleged to be mutilated by Marcion, 348 f.; views of critics on this, 348 f.; Sanday's linguistic analysis proves it to be original of Marcion's gospel, 361 f.; the consequence of this, 362 f.; statement in Canon of Muratori, 429; circumstances excluding Luke's authorship, 600 f.; indications of date of, 601 f., 611; use of works of Josephus, 605 f.; the journey to Emmaus, 837 f.; appearance to the Eleven, 838 f.

MANSEL, Dean, miracles inseparable from Christianity, 5 f.; analysis of miracles, 23 f.; argument of Efficient Cause, 24 f.; assumption of a Personal God, 40 f.

Marcion, account of, 344 f.; his work *Antitheses*, 346 f.; attacked by Tertullian, 346 f.; his gospel, 348 f.; views of critics, 348 f.; works of Tertullian and Epiphanius against him, 352 f.; Reuss on him, 353 f.; was his gospel that of Luke, 354 f.; views of Hahn, Ritschl, Volkmar, and Hilgenfeld, 355 f.; Dr. Sanday's linguistic analysis proves it a mutilated Luke, 361 f.; his views adopted, 361; result, 362 f.; no evidence of his knowing other Synoptics, 363 f.; no evidence that he knew fourth Gospel, 499 f.

Mark, Gospel of, tradition of Papias, 278 f.; Mark said to be interpreter of Peter, 279 f.; this tradition examined, 281 f.; not applicable to our Gospel, 283 f.

Matthew, Gospel of, account of Papias, 286 f.; meaning of Oracles of the Lord, 287 f.; not applicable to our Gospel, 281 f.; Matthew wrote in Hebrew, 286 f.; our Gospel Greek, 290 f.; not a translation, 295 f.; not that described by Papias, 295 f.; a history of Jesus the Messiah, 642 f.; the last appearance of Jesus, 842.

Melito of Sardis, 387 f.; Dr. Westcott's interpretation of his mention of "Old Books," 387 f.; translation of fragment, 388; no reference to New Testament, 388 f.; ignorance of Melito of books of O. T., 391 f.; other supposed works of, 392 f.; no evidence for fourth Gospel, 505.

Messiah, Synoptics the history of Jesus as the, 642 f. ; a suffering, 644 f.
Meyer on the Gift of Tongues, 784 f.
Mill, J. S., on Hume's argument on miracles, 46 f.
Milman, Dean, on the Age of Miracles, 56 f.; on demoniacal possession, 84 f.; on martyrdom in reign of Trajan, 166, n. 1; account of earthquake at Antioch, 168; on miracles at Crucifixion, 818, n. 1, 882.
Miracles, necessary to attest Revelation, 1 f.; dual character, 7 f.; incompetent to perform function, 10 f.; their relation to order of Nature, 18 f.; the Age of, 55 f.; permanent stream of miraculous pretension, 83 f.; Christian and Pagan, 91 f.; continuance of miraculous power, 92 f.; ecclesiastical, 93 f.; of Narcissus of Jerusalem, 97; of Gregory of Nyssa, 97 f.; of St. Anthony, 98 f.; reported by St. Augustine, 100 f.; in relation to superstition, 109 f.; no distinction between Gospel and other, 110 f.; alleged belief of civilised world, 116 f.; evidence required for, 118 f.; direct evidence for, 753 f.; no one claims directly to have worked a miracle, 756 f.; the evidence of Paul, 756 f.; proportionate evidence for, 803 f.
Mozley, Dr., Christianity must be attested by miracles, 4 f.; real character of miracles, 11 f.; analysis of miracles, 22 f.; argument regarding Efficient Cause, 25 f.; miracles asserted to be not contrary to Order of Nature, 28 f.; the argument from experience, 33 f.; assumption of Personal Deity, 37 f.; asserts distinctive character of Christian miracles, 92 f.; alleged difference between Gospel and other miracles, 112 f.
Muratori, Canon of, described, 428 f.; statement regarding Luke's Gospel, 429; other books, 429 f.; date, 430 f.; statement regarding Shepherd of Hermas, 430 f.; statement regarding composition of fourth Gospel, 507 f.

NEANDER, on martyrdom of Ignatius, 167; rejects Ignatian Epistles, 167; on views of *Clementine Homilies* opposed to fourth Gospel, 489 f., 496; on the Gift of Tongues, 784, 786.
Newman, Dr., Miracles necessary to prove Revelation, 4; their evidential value, 9 f.; on tendency of religious minds to superstition, 56 f.

ORIGEN, his cosmical theories, 75 f.; on Resurrection, 892.

PALEY, on miracles, 40 f.; argument against Hume, 51 f.; on Paul's visits to Jerusalem, 698, n. 2.
Papias of Hierapolis, miracle narrated by, 93; date of, 276; fragments of his Exposition, 276 f.; his statements regarding Presbyters, 276 f.; tradition regarding Mark, 277 f.; preferred tradition to written works, 277, 297 f.; not applicable to our second Synoptic, 281 f.; account of Gospel ascribed to Matthew, 286 f.; meaning of "Oracles of the Lord," 287 f.; work not the same as our first Synoptic, 289 f.; used Gospel of the Hebrews, 297 f.; on death of Judas, 296; woman accused of many sins from Gospel of Hebrews, 297; no evidence for fourth Gospel, 477 f.; argument of Tischendorf on supposed use of Epistle of John, 478 f.; statement regarding him and fourth Gospel in Latin MS., 479 f.; Irenæus and quotations from Presbyters, 479 f.; not the Presbyters of Papias, 482 f.; his testimony to Apocalypse, 485 f.
Paul, the Apostle, animosity against him in Clementines, 318 f.; attacks on him in Apocalypse, 522 f., 747 f.; parallelism between him and Peter in Acts, 617 f.; shows no knowledge of Stephen, 661 f.; Ananias and, in Acts, 679 f.; Epistles of, compared with Acts, 686 f.; his actions after conversion in Epistles and Acts compared, 687 f.; visits to Jerusalem in Epistles and Acts compared, 689 f.; question of circumcision at Antioch in Acts, 700 f.; compared with Epistles, 701 f.; the Council at Jerusalem not mentioned by, 703 f.; Peter's speech, 706 f.; his quarrel with Peter, 708 f.; his writings exclude Apostolic Decree, 718 f.; alleged circumcision of Titus in Acts, 725 f.; his irony regarding Apostles, 726 f.; final attitude of Apostles mere toleration, 729; he

preaches a different Gospel, 730 f.; gave no preference to Jews, 732 f.; his alleged circumcision of Timothy not historic, 736 f.; his whole conduct in Acts opposed to his principles, 739 f.; his relations to the Twelve, 744 f.; his testimony for miracles, 763 f.; nature of the Charismata, 768 f.; on the Gift of Tongues, 779 f., 790 f.; does not mean foreign languages, 790 f.; Interpretation of Tongues, 793 f.; on abuse of the Gifts, 794 f.; probable nature of the Gift of Tongues, 797 f.; his Stake in the flesh, 799 f.; his evidence for miracles, 801 f.; his evidence for the Resurrection, 851 f.; influence on, of Prophetic Gnosis, 852 f.; appearances mentioned by, 854 f.; the appearance to Cephas, 855 f.; to the Twelve, 856; to the 500 brethren, 856 f.; to James, 857; from whom did he "receive" these reports, 857 f.; value of his evidence, 858 f.; his own vision of Jesus, 861 f.; his conversion not attributed to this vision, 864 f.; representation of it in Acts, 867 f.; his conversion according to Acts, 871 f.; his evidence for the Resurrection inadequate, 872 f.; date of his information, 883 f.; effect of time upon memory, 885 f.; his vision subjective, 892 f.; his preparation for it, 893 f.; his Visions and Revelations, 895 f.; his apotheosis of Jesus, 901.

Peter, the Gospel of, the Akhmîm fragment, 207 f.

Philo Judæus considers stars spiritual beings, 61; his Logos doctrine, 444 f., 450 f., 454 f.; his account of Moses giving the Law, 785 f.

Polycarp, Epistle of, 175 f.; alleged references to Synoptics, 178 f.; alleged evidence for fourth Gospel, 445 f.

Powell, Prof. Baden, on Deity working miracles, 43 f.; not miracles but narrative of them now in question, 118.

Pressensé, de, on the Gift of Tongues, 786.

Proselytes to Judaism, 653 f.

Ptolemæus and Heracleon, date of, 408 f.; Tischendorf's arguments on, 409 f.; refuted, 411 f.; alleged references to Synoptics, 420 f.; no evidence for fourth Gospel, 506 f.

Resurrection and Ascension, evidence of the Gospels, 808 f.; evidence of Paul, 851 f.; evidence inadequate, 872 f.; theory of survival or "Scheintod," 875 f.; the Vision hypothesis, 877 f.; effects of time on memory, 883 f.; mental preparation of the Twelve and Paul for belief in, 886 f.; on the third day, 889 f.; effect of Prophetic Gnosis, 890 f.; Jesus only appeared to believers, 891 f.; argument that they were proclaimed without refutation, 898 f.; disbelieved at the time, 899 f.

Sanday, Dr., on Marcion's Gospel, 361 f.; on evidence of Paul for miracles, 756 f., 801 f.

Scott, Sir Walter, on vision of Byron, 879 f.

Shepherd of Hermas, 148; has no quotations, 148 f.; statements regarding it in Canon of Muratori, 430 f.; alleged references to fourth Gospel, 436 f.

Stanley, Dean, on state of things in Apostolic age, 775, n. 1; on state of Corinth, 779, n. 1.

Stephen, Martyrdom of, in Acts, 659 f.; no evidence elsewhere of his existence, 661 f.; his trial, 662 f.; based on that of Jesus, 663 f.; speech examined, 665 f.; speech composed by author of Acts, 670 f.

Tatian, cosmical theories of, 72; account of him, 366 f.; alleged references to the Synoptics, 366 f.; date of his literary career, 368 f.; his *Diatessaron*, 370 f.; statements of Eusebius, 370 f.; of Epiphanius, 371 f.; called by some Gospel of the Hebrews, 371 f.; Harmony of Gospels by Ammonius, 371, 373 f.; Theodoret confiscates *Diatessaron*, 372 f.; statements in *Doctrine of Addai*, 372 f.; reference of Victor of Capua to it, 373 f.; he calls it *Diapente*, 374; reference by Bar-Ali, 374; by Bar-Salibi, 375; Rendel Harris on fragment of Bar-Hebræus, 375; Commentary on *Diatessaron* by Mar Ephrem, 375 f.; language of *Diatessaron*, 376; Ephrem's Commentary published, 376; was it on Tatian's *Diatessaron*,

376 f.; Victor of Capua's Latin Harmony, 376 f.; Hemphill on Victor of Capua, 377; was it Tatian's *Diatessaron*, 377 f.; Arabic MSS. purporting to be *Diatessaron*, 377 f.; discrepancies, 378 f.; Rendel Harris on Arabic *Diatessaron*, 380; Zahn's opinion, 380 f.; Harnack's, 380; Resch's, 380; value of *Diatessaron* as evidence, 381; alleged references to fourth Gospel in *Address to the Greeks*, 500 f.; his Logos doctrine not that of fourth Gospel, 501 f.; value of evidence of *Diatessaron* for fourth Gospel, 504 f.

Taylor, Dr., on Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, 149, 151, 441.

Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, 149 f.; supposed early references to, 149 f.; dissertation on the "Two Ways," 150 f.; date, 151 f., 153 f.; Dr. Lightfoot on, 151; its relation to Epistle of Barnabas and Shepherd of Hermas, 151 f.; relation to other works, 152 f.; was it quoted by Clement as Scripture, 152 f.; alleged references to Synoptics examined, 154 f.; alleged references to fourth Gospel, 440 f.; Hebraisms of Eucharistic prayers pointed out by Dr. Taylor and Rendel Harris, 441.

Tertullian, evidential value of miracles, 9, n. 1; cosmical theories, 73 f.; on change of sex of animals, 82; on Marcion's *Antitheses*, 346 f.; his Epistle to Romans did not contain passage giving precedence to Jews, 734.

Theodoret on Tatian's *Diatessaron*, 372 f.

Trench, Archbishop, evidential value of miracles, 10 f.; analysis of miracles, 19 f.; exemption from law of gravitation a lost prerogative of men, 32, n. 1; on demoniacal possession at present day, 85 f.; miraculous power in Church, when withdrawn, 93 f.

Tuke, Dr., instances of ideational impression on Sensorium, 879 f., 881.

Valentinus, alleged references to Synoptics, 330 f.; unwarrantable statements of Tischendorf, 330 f.; system of reference of Hippolytus, 330 f.; references of Irenæus, 332 f.; references not to, but to school, 332 f.; unwarrantable statements of Dr. Westcott, 333 f.; alleged references examined, 334 f.; who made alleged references, 337 f.; alleged references to fourth Gospel, 498 f.

Vienne and Lyons, Epistle of, 404 f.; alleged references to Synoptics, 405 f.; alleged references to fourth Gospel, 506.

Westcott, Dr., on a Personal God, 41, n. 2; on uncritical character of first two centuries, 286, n. 1; on seven doubtful books of the Canon, 753; his Gospel of the Resurrection, 803, n. 2; on inscriptions on the Cross, 810; on various narratives of the Resurrection, 847, n. 2; existence of a Christian society the strongest evidence for the Resurrection, 873 f.

Wette, de, on authorship of fourth Gospel and Apocalypse, 512.

Witchcraft, belief in, 86 f.; proscribed by Church and State, 87 f.; belief now dispelled, 89 f.

Wordsworth, Dr., on the Acts of the Apostles, 587, n. 6.

Xenophanes of Colophon, on God, 44.

Zeller, on the Gift of Tongues, 783 f.

WATTS & CO., PRINTERS, 17, JOHNSON'S COURT, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

THE RATIONALIST PRESS ASSOCIATION,

LIMITED.

Registered Office—17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

Chairman:

GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE.

Honorary Associates:

LESLIE STEPHEN	EMILE ZOLA	ED. WESTERMARCK
EDWARD CLODD	ERNST HAECKEL	PAUL CARUS
J. M. ROBERTSON	W. C. COUPLAND	F. J. GOULD
STANTON COIT	W. R. W. SULLIVAN	J. G. R. FORLONG

THE Association is a Company limited by Guarantee, and not having a Capital divided into Shares. It was formally incorporated in 1899 under the Companies' Acts in order to give the fullest security that money subscribed or bequeathed to its funds shall be used for certain specified purposes, the chief of these being the encouragement and dissemination of literature of a scientific, critical, or philosophical character.

For full particulars apply to the Secretary at above address.

A SHORT HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

By JOHN M. ROBERTSON.

Cloth, 6s. net, by post 6s. 4d.

Part I.—Primitive Christianity.

CHAPTER I.: THE BEGINNINGS.—Documentary Clues—The Earliest Christian Sects—Personality of the Nominal Founder—Myth of the Twelve Apostles—Primary Forms of the Cult—Rise of Gentile Christism—Growth of the Christ Myth.

CHAPTER II.: THE ENVIRONMENT.—Social and Mental Conditions in the Roman Empire—Jewish Orthodoxy—Jewish Sects: the Essenes—Gentile Cults—Ethics: Popular and Philosophic.

CHAPTER III.: CONDITIONS OF SURVIVAL.—Popular Appeal—Economic Causation—Organisation and Sacred Books—Concession and Fixation—Cosmic Philosophy.

Part II.—Christianity from the Second Century to the Rise of Mohammedanism.

CHAPTER I.: SCOPE AND CHARACTER OF THE UNESTABLISHED CHURCH.—Numbers and Inner Life—Growth of the Priesthood—The Gnostic Movement in the Second Century—Marcionism and Montanism—Rites and Ceremonies—Strifes over Primary Dogma.

CHAPTER II.: RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE.—Persecutions—Establishment and Creed-Making—Reaction under Julian—Re-establishment: Disestablishment of Paganism.

CHAPTER III.: FAILURE WITH SURVIVAL.—The Overthrow of Arianism—The Cost of Orthodoxy—Moral and Intellectual Stagnation—The Social Failure.

Part III.—Medieval Christianity.

CHAPTER I.: EXPANSION AND ORGANISATION.—Position in the Seventh Century—Methods of Expansion—Growth of the Papacy.

CHAPTER II.: RELIGIOUS EVOLUTION AND STRIFE.—Growth of Idolatry and Polytheism—Doctrines of the Eucharist, Purgatory, and Confession—Rationalistic Heresies—Anti-clerical Heresies.

CHAPTER III.: THE SOCIAL LIFE AND STRUCTURE.—The Clergy, Regular and Secular—The Higher Theology and its Effects—Christianity and Feudalism—Influence of the Crusades.

CHAPTER IV.: THE INTELLECTUAL LIFE.—Superstition and Intolerance—The Inquisition—Classic Survivals and Saracen Contacts—Religion and Art.

CHAPTER V.: BYZANTINE CHRISTIANITY.

Part IV.—Modern Christianity.

CHAPTER I.: THE REFORMATION.—Moral and Intellectual Forces—Political and Economic Forces—Social and Political Results—Intellectual Results.

CHAPTER II.: PROGRESS OF ANTI-CHRISTIAN THOUGHT.—The Physical Sciences—Philosophy, Cosmic and Moral—Biblical and Historical Criticism.

CHAPTER III.: POPULAR ACCEPTANCE.—Catholic Christianity—Protestant Christianity—Greek Christianity.

CHAPTER IV.—THE RELATION TO PROGRESS.—Moral Influence—Intellectual Influence—Conclusion and Prognosis.

SYNOPSIS OF LITERATURE. INDEX.

Agents for the Rationalist Press Association, Limited:

WATTS & CO., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

LATEST WORK BY JOHN M. ROBERTSON.

Letters on Reasoning.

3s. 6d. net, by post 3s. 10d.

The aim of these "Letters" is to elicit and stimulate the reasoning power by exercising it on actual subjects, without resort to the traditional machinery of logic.

Other Works by John M. Robertson.

CHRISTIANITY AND MYTHOLOGY.

Demy 8vo, cloth, xviii.–484 pp.; 8s. 6d. net, by post 9s.

PART I.—The Progress of Mythology.

PART II.—Christ and Krishna.

PART III.—The Gospel Myths.

"Has been executed with great thoroughness, and evinces not only learning and ingenuity, but a determination to get, if possible, at the truth of things."—*Literature.*

"Mr. Robertson here presents us with a volume of nearly 500 pages, all of them marked with evidences of wide reading, acute insight, and an incisive use of language.....Of Mr. Robertson's competence and honesty in this work, as a whole, we have formed a high opinion."—*Daily Chronicle.*

STUDIES IN RELIGIOUS FALLACY.

Cloth, 3s. 6d.

Contents:—1. Dogma in Masquerade—2. Mr. Lang on Origin of Christianity—3. Appendix Thereto—4. Mr. Lang on Miracles—5. The Tory Religion—6. Mr. Gladstone on the Atonement—7. Mr. Gladstone on Butler—8. The Jesus Legend and the Myth of the Twelve Apostles—9. The Myth of Judas Iscariot—10. Freeman on Christianity—11. The Feeling for Religion.

By the same author, in preparation at the time of going to press:—

PAGAN CHRISTS.

Agents for the Rationalist Press Association, Limited:

WATTS & Co., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

PROFESSOR BUCHNER'S LAST WORK.

LAST WORDS ON MATERIALISM

AND KINDRED SUBJECTS.

By PROFESSOR LUDWIG BÜCHNER.

With Portrait of the Author and Biographical Sketch by his brother, PROFESSOR ALEX BÜCHNER.

Popular edition, xxxiv.–299 pp.; 2s. 6d. net, by post 2s. 10d.

Immediately before his death in 1899 PROFESSOR BÜCHNER gathered together the many essays in which he had defended and developed his views, and left them for publication under the title of *Im Dienste der Wahrheit*. The essays are now translated into English by Mr. JOSEPH MCCABE, under the title of *Last Words on Materialism*. Many of these papers deal, as the title indicates, with the absorbing question of Materialism; but light is thrown upon it from all sides of science and philosophy, and a number of ethical and historical questions are included.

THE FAITH OF AN AGNOSTIC;

OR, FIRST ESSAYS IN RATIONALISM.

By GEORGE FORESTER.

Cloth, 5s.

CONTENTS:—

Introductory
The Old Enigma
The Conflict between Science and Religion
An Object Lesson
The Persistence of Dogmatic Theology
A Man-made Marvel
An After Life
The Possible Behind the Veil
Not what is Satisfying, but what is True
Thoughts in a Meat-market
The Immaterial
Social Evolution: A Study in Pseudo-Science
Some Old Riddles

"The author's position is well and cleverly defended, and he writes with an evident sincerity that commands respect."—*Liverpool Mercury.*

"Ably reasoned, and stated with an engaging liveliness."—*Scotsman.*

"The author has a delightfully lucid style."—*Reynolds's Newspaper.*

"It is impossible to read a great part of the book.....without a very lively interest and appreciation."—*Brighton Herald.*

Agents for the Rationalist Press Association, Limited:
WATTS & Co., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

On the Progress of Liberty of Thought

During Queen Victoria's Reign.

By CONSTANCE E. PLUMPTRE.

Cloth 2s., by post 2s. 3d.; paper 1s., by post 1s. 2d.

A Comparison between the Religious Toleration of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries—Rationalising Influences within the Churches during Queen Victoria's Reign—Digression on the Passing Wave of Religious Reaction—On the Full Development of Rationalism beyond the Churches during Queen Victoria's Reign.

The Children's Book of Moral Lessons.

By F. J. GOULD.

205 pp.; cloth, 2s., by post 2s. 3d.

While theology is strictly excluded from the lessons here reproduced, they are constructed on such a humanitarian basis as to fit them for use in homes and schools of all classes and creeds. The book has been translated into German by Dr. Penzig, of Berlin.

The Bible in School: A Question of Ethics.

By J. ALLANSON PICTON

(Formerly M.P. for Leicester, and one of the first members of the London School Board).

Cloth 2s., by post 2s. 3d.; paper 1s., by post 1s. 2d.

This is a stirring appeal on a question of vast political and social importance to Englishmen. Mr. Picton maintains that the present Bible teaching in Board schools practically amounts to the teaching of dogmas common to the Evangelical party. It is unfair to such ratepayers as disbelieve those dogmas; demoralising to such teachers as, secretly doubting the evangelical view, are constrained to hide their doubts; and injurious to the children themselves in many ways.

The Religion of the First Christians.

By F. J. GOULD.

Cloth, 2s. 6d.

"Regards Christianity as the natural product of a puritan and uncultured proletariat seeking fellowship and hope."—*Literature.*

"Mr. F. J. Gould's.....maturer tone is so broad and sympathetic that even professed teachers of the Christian religion may be willing to learn from him."—*Daily News.*

Agents for the Rationalist Press Association, Limited:

WATTS & Co., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

CHEAP RATIONALIST REPRINTS.

THE RATIONALIST PRESS ASSOCIATION, LIMITED, is issuing a Series of **Reprints** of LEADING RATIONALIST WORKS at the Popular Price of **SIXPENCE** (by post 8d.). Each number consists of not less than 128 large pages, printed in bold, clear type, and on good paper. The following are already included in the Series :—

Lectures and Essays. *Out of print.*

By THOMAS HENRY HUXLEY.

(WITH PORTRAIT OF THE AUTHOR.)

A Selection including: Autobiography—Three Lectures on Evolution—The Physical Basis of Life—Naturalism and Supernaturalism—The Value of Witness to the Miraculous—Agnosticism—The Christian Tradition in Relation to Judaic Christianity—Agnosticism and Christianity.

The Pioneers of Evolution.

From Thales to Huxley.

With an Intermediate Chapter on the Causes of Arrest of the Movement.

By EDWARD CLODD,

Author of *The Childhood of the World*, *The Story of Creation*, etc.

Modern Science and Modern Thought.

By the late SAMUEL LAING,

Author of *A Modern Zoroastrian*, *Human Origins*, *Problems of the Future*, etc.

Revised and brought up to date, with a Biographical Introduction, by EDWARD CLODD.

Literature and Dogma:

An Essay Towards a Better Apprehension of the Bible.

By MATTHEW ARNOLD.

In preparation at time of going to press :—

The Riddle of the Universe. (UNABRIDGED.)

By PROFESSOR ERNST HAECKEL. Translated by JOSEPH MCCABE.

Agents for the Rationalist Press Association, Limited:
WATTS & CO., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

A New Catechism.

By M. M. MANGASARIAN.

80 large pp., with wrapper, price 6d., by post 8d.

This work has already attained wide popularity in America, several editions having been disposed of in a remarkably short space of time. The author is an ex-Presbyterian pastor, who is now the lecturer of the Independent Religious Society of Chicago, and addresses each Sunday an audience of over a thousand people. The present edition of the book has been specially revised and prepared for the English public, and, in order to ensure a large circulation, is being issued in good style at the very low price of sixpence. In America the published price, in cloth, is 75c. (three shillings), in paper 50c. (two shillings). The following are a few American opinions concerning this striking work :—

"M. M. Mangasarian's *New Catechism* contains in succinct form the very essence of advanced thought in religious matters. The platform of the book is one with which persons of common sense will hardly dare to disagree." —*Chicago American.*

"In my opinion the *New Catechism* embodies the best thought of the age, and is destined to contribute powerfully to the change in public sentiment which is now going on."—JUDGE C. B. WAITE.

"I have not a moment's hesitation in saying the *New Catechism* is the greatest of all great books written for the promotion of rational thought. It is the one book that will pass unchallenged." —C. E. ELDRIDGE, *The Philosopher.*

"The *New Catechism* comes nearer being the *true* Catechism than any book of this kind which we have ever read. It covers the ground completely. There is hardly a word that could be changed for the better."—L. K. WASHBURN (Boston).

"Mr. Mangasarian's *Catechism* ought to be very instructive and interesting to thoughtful people. He tells the unvarnished truth about things generally regarded as too sacred to discuss."—*The Ethical Record.*

In preparation at time of going to press :—

A Handbook to the Study of Evolution.

By DENNIS HIRD

(Warden of Ruskin Hall, Oxford).

Written in the simplest possible language and referring to the latest researches, this work is intended to aid the busy general reader to grasp the arguments in favour of Evolution as they now stand.

Agents for the Rationalist Press Association, Limited:

WATTS & Co., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

In preparation at time of going to press :—

Mr. Balfour's Philosophy of Religion Critically Examined.

By W. B. COLUMBINE.

2s. 6d. net, by post 2s. 10d.

Agents for the Rationalist Press Association, Limited:
WATTS & Co., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

Price 6d., by post 7d.

The Agnostic Annual

FOR 1903.

Containing articles by George Jacob Holyoake ("The Story of My Religious Days"), Lady Florence Dixie ("The Old Religion and the New"), Geoffrey Mortimer ("Humanity and Rationalism"), F. J. Gould ("The New Secularism"), Joseph McCabe ("The Abiding Element in Religion"), J. M. Robertson, Charles Watts ("The Philosophy of Rationalism"), Miss Plumptre ("On Professor Tyndall's Comparative Eclipse of Fame"), George Forester "Determinism and 'Moral Responsibility'"), and others.

WATTS & Co., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

Monthly, 2d., by post 2½d., or with Supplement (January, April, July, and October) 3d. Annual Subscription, 2s. 8d. post free.

The Literary Guide

AND RATIONALIST REVIEW.

In addition to reviews of the best books on Religion, Ethics, Science, and Philosophy, each number of the *Literary Guide* contains articles expository of Rationalism, frequently from the pens of prominent writers.

The whole of the numbers for the past year may be obtained, handsomely bound in cloth, price 4s. 6d., carriage paid.

Specimen Copy post free.

WATTS & Co., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

20689

211
R17

Supernatural religion /
Rationalist Press
Assn

211
R17

20689

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709